Research Repository UCD

Title	Hierarchical parameterization and compression-based object modelling of high net: gross but poorly amalgamated deep-water lobe deposits
Authors(s)	Manzocchi, Tom, Zhang, Leifu, Haughton, Peter D. W., Pontén, A.
Publication date	2020-01-27
Publication information	Manzocchi, Tom, Leifu Zhang, Peter D. W. Haughton, and A. Pontén. "Hierarchical Parameterization and Compression-Based Object Modelling of High Net: Gross but Poorly Amalgamated Deep-Water Lobe Deposits" 26, no. 4 (January 27, 2020).
Publisher	Geological Society of London
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/11558
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1144/petgeo2018-078

Downloaded 2023-04-07T10:52:29Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information

Hierarchical parameterization and compression-based object modelling of high net: gross but poorly
amalgamated deep-water lobe deposits

T. Manzocchi^{1,2*}, L. Zhang^{1,3}, P. W. D. Haughton^{4,2}, A. Pontén⁵.

1. Fault Analysis Group, UCD School of Earth Sciences, University College Dublin, Ireland.

2. Irish Centre for Research in Applied Geosciences (iCRAG), University College Dublin, Ireland.

3. Current address: Research Institute of Petroleum Exploration and Development, PetroChina,
Beijing, China.

4. Marine and Petroleum Geology Group, UCD School of Earth Sciences, University College Dublin,
Ireland.

5. Equinor ASA, Research Centre Rotvoll, NO-7005 Trondheim, Norway.

* Corresponding author: Tom.Manzocchi@ucd.ie

Short title: Hierarchical compression-based modelling

Abstract

Deepwater lobe deposits are arranged hierarchically and can be characterized by high net:gross ratios but poor sand connectivity due to thin but laterally extensive shale layers. This heterogeneity makes them difficult to represent in standard full-field object-based models, since the sands in an object-based model are not stacked compensationally and become connected at a low net:gross ratio. The compression algorithm allows generation of low connectivity object-based models at high net:gross ratios, by including the net: gross and amalgamation ratios as independent input parameters. Object-based modelling constrained by the compression algorithm has been included in a recursive workflow, permitting generation of realistic models of hierarchical lobe deposits. Representative dimensional and stacking parameters collected at four different hierarchical levels have been used to constrain a 250 m thick, 14 km² model that includes hierarchical elements ranging from 20 cm thick sand beds to 30+ m thick lobe complexes. Sand beds and the fine-grained units are represented explicitly in the model, and the characteristic facies associations often used to parameterize lobe deposits are emergent from the modelling process. The model is subsequently resampled without loss of accuracy for flow simulation, and results show clearly the influence of the hierarchical heterogeneity on drainage and sweep efficiency during a water-flood simulation.

End of Abstract

The objective of geostatistical reservoir modelling is to build geocellular models that can be interrogated to provide insights into a particular aspect of a reservoir of interest. Small-scale features that cannot be imaged in seismic reflection data but are likely to be present are included stochastically if they are expected to influence the question the model was built to address. Often geomodels provide the three-dimensional heterogeneous porosity / permeability framework for flow simulation modelling, and if used for this purpose it is important that the method used to generate the model is able to reproduce the key geometrical characteristics of the reservoir geology that influence reservoir flow.

Deep-water turbidite lobe deposits host important hydrocarbon reserves globally, but contain heterogeneities that make them difficult to represent in reservoir geomodelling. They often consist of layered successions of interbedded reservoir units of finite lateral extent, and non-reservoir fine-grained baffles and barriers. Standard object-based modelling, placing reservoir objects (e.g. sand beds) in a non-reservoir background (e.g. shale), results in well-connected reservoir volumes at object volume fractions in excess of about 30% (e.g. King 1990, Hovadik and Larue 2010). Compensational stacking, however, can lead to low sandstone connectivity at much higher sand fractions, a combination that is very difficult to reproduce in stochastic object-based models (Cosentino, 2001; Larue and Hovadik, 2006; Manzocchi et al. 2007).

A second factor that complicates geomodel construction for turbidite lobe reservoirs is the presence of a hierarchical arrangement of depositional elements (e.g. Gervais et al., 2006; Prlat et al., 2009, Cullis et al. 2018). Object-based modelling can be applied in a hierarchical scheme (e.g. Deutsch and Wang; 1996), but hierarchical level-specific variations in compensational stacking (Straub and Pyles 2012) exacerbate the difficulties of honouring element connectivity in the modelling process. Because of these issues, academic studies that have focused on achieving a realistic level of connectivity at specific hierarchical levels for sensitivity flow modelling have relied on deterministic, rather than stochastic, modelling methods to represent the heterogeneity of hierarchical lobe

systems (e.g. Amy et al., 2013; Hofstra et al., 2016). Deterministic modelling of sub-seismic heterogeneities, however, is not a practical solution for routine reservoir geomodelling. Difficulties in generating low connectivity, high volume fraction models are not limited to object-based modelling. For example, models built using the Truncated Gaussian Simulation method have similar net:gross-specific connectivity thresholds as object-based models (e.g. Larue and Hovadik 2006). Pixel-based multiple-point statistics methods often fail to reproduce the connectivity of their training images (e.g. Tahmasebi 2018). Recent research developing new methods for modelling more realistic systems include the compression-based modelling method applied in the present work (Manzocchi et al., 2007); rule-based and process-based modelling (e.g. Pyrcz et al. 2015, Hawie et al. 2018) which depart from standard geostatistical approaches by applying time-dependent, more or less physical considerations in the model construction and are able to produce models that look very realistic; and pattern-based, as opposed to pixel-based, multiple-point statistics methods (e.g. Tahmasebi 2018).

Compression-based object modelling was devised for generating binary geomodels consisting of poorly connected reservoir units interlayered with non-reservoir shales (Figure 1). The compression algorithm is applied within an object-based modelling workflow and allows the target average amalgamation ratio of the objects to be defined as an input parameter in addition to the global object volume fraction which is the constraining input parameter of a standard object-based model. For the idealized binary systems we consider in this paper, we use the term shale to mean any non-net fine-grained lithologies, define net: gross ratio as the fractional model volume occupied by sand as opposed to shale, and the amalgamation ratio as the fraction of sandstone bed bases in contact with an underlying sandstone bed as opposed to a shale interbed, when measured in a 1D vertical sample-line (e.g. Chapin et al., 1994; Stephen et al. 2001; Manzocchi et al., 2007).

In conventional object-based modelling with no constraining trends, objects of a specific shape and size are placed at random positions within the modelling volume until the target volume fraction for

the model is achieved (e.g. Haldorsen and Damsleth, 1990). The amalgamation ratio of the resultant model is an unconstrained outcome of the modelling process rather than a user-defined input variable. Geometrical considerations and sensitivity modelling have shown that for object-based models with constant sized beds, the model amalgamation ratio is equal to the net: gross ratio (Manzocchi et al. 2007). In natural deep-water deposits, however, the net: gross ratio is often considerably greater than the amalgamation ratio (e.g. Manzocchi et al., 2007, Romans et al., 2009, Figure 1a), with the implication that objects in a conventional object-based model are better connected than they are in the natural system that the model is trying to emulate. The compression algorithm, which is described in detail later in the paper, decouples the relationship between amalgamation ratio and net: gross ratio to allow for the generation of models with more realistic connectivity (Figure 1b, c).

The objective of the current work is to assess the extent to which compression-based modelling can be applied to generate and flow simulate hierarchical lobate reservoir successions containing bed-scale heterogeneities. First, we describe the conceptual geological model underlying our approach, and the data from diverse lobe deposits we have collected and parameterized within a unified hierarchical framework for quantifying it. These data are drawn primarily from the literature but are complemented by new field data collected in the Ross Formation in the west of Ireland (Zhang 2015). Next, a description is given of the modelling procedures devised to generate hierarchical compression-based object models. These procedures have been implemented in a stand-alone code which takes as input surfaces defining a deterministic reservoir zonation and which outputs a model in a conventional format for flow simulation. The description focuses on the innovative aspects of the modelling, which are the application of the compression method, the procedure used to manage multiple hierarchical grids, and the approach for resampling these grids to define the input to a flow simulation model. Finally, a large scale, bed-resolution geomodel built using representative parameters, and its behaviour under a simulated production water-flood, are described.

HIERARCHICAL PARAMETERISATION OF LOBE DEPOSITS

Abundant research has demonstrated that deep-water lobe deposits are structured hierarchically (e.g. Gervais et al., 2006; Deptuck et al., 2008; Saller et al., 2008; Prlat et al., 2009, 2010; Grundvg et al., 2014). A popular hierarchical classification is that of Prlat et al. (2009), which is based on bounding surfaces. In this scheme (Figure 2a), individual sandstone beds deposited by single flow events are stacked within lobe elements; a few lobe elements are stacked within a discrete lobe, and a few lobes are arranged to form a lobe complex. At each hierarchical level these sand-prone elements are separated by fine-grained units, and the thickness and distribution area of these fine-grained units increases at larger hierarchical scales. Hence beds (where not amalgamated), are separated by inter-beds, lobe elements are separated by inter-lobe elements, and lobes are separated by inter-lobes.

Hierarchical element stacking is controlled by different scales of avulsion in the deep-marine channels feeding sediment to these more distal lobe deposits. These avulsions are controlled in part by the evolving topography of the deposits, leading to a greater degree of compensational stacking at larger hierarchical scales (e.g. Straub and Pyles, 2012). Both the period of deposition and the origin of the sediment deposited during the interval between deposition of hierarchical components are controlled by these larger scale avulsions. Hence the inter-bed fine-grained units are deposited in the short intervals of time between the individual turbidite flows that deposited individual sand beds, and are sourced principally from the same feeder channel. There is little time for deposition of extremely fine-grained hemipelagic sediments between deposition of the beds, so the interbeds are relatively coarse-grained consisting, for example, in the Ross Formation predominantly of silt. At larger hierarchical scales, the period of deposition between elements increases, and the proportion of relatively coarse-grained material sourced from the channel decreases, leading to progressively finer-grained, more pelagic-rich sediments. This trend culminates in the Ross Formation with the deposition of the extremely fine-grained goniatite-rich black shale condensed sequence (i.e. "marine

bands”) deposits which represent inter-lobe complex fines when referenced to the hierarchy considered here.

The main source of connectivity between elements of the same hierarchical level (i.e. lobe-to-lobe connectivity or lobe element-to-lobe element connectivity) is provided by erosion of the hierarchically-associated fine-grained deposits (i.e. the inter-lobes or the inter-lobe elements), and hence amalgamation of the objects. Large-scale correlation panels often show unamalgamated lobe complexes, rare amalgamation between lobes, and more common amalgamation between lobe elements. This pattern is present, for example, in the correlation panel from Svalbard reproduced in Figure 2b (Grundvåg et al., 2014). This shows decametre thick lobe complexes containing up to six lobes, each containing a few lobe elements up to two or three meters thick. Smaller hierarchical elements require small-scale observations, and Figure 2c, for example, shows a bed-scale outcrop photo from the Ross Formation (Western Ireland). Here, the central lobe is composed of three unamalgamated lobe elements each about 1.5m thick. These consist mainly of an amalgamated set of beds at the top of the lobe element, within which occasional discontinuous remnant bedding surfaces can be identified. Below this, the inter-lobe element consists of poorly amalgamated sandstone beds a few centimetres thick, and fine-grained material. Lobe element fringe deposits are not present in Figure 2c, but in the same way that the lobe elements separate laterally towards the edges of the lobes at the larger scale (Figure 2b), beds separate laterally towards the edges of lobe elements.

In this conceptual model, fringe deposits are an integral part of an element and consist of the fine-grained deposits one hierarchical level smaller. The fringe regions of lobes, for example, are made up of inter-lobe element deposits. If one lobe overlies another lobe in the same lobe complex, they will be separated by fine-grained inter-lobe deposits unless amalgamated. Hence, if a logged section samples the fringe regions of both these lobes, then the sequence sampled will be inter-lobe element deposits underlying inter-lobe deposits, underlying more inter-lobe element deposits. Of

course, it is very difficult to differentiate between these fine-grained units in practice, but the conceptual framework allows for the continuum between the endmember cases illustrated by Prlat et al. (2009, their Fig 16) to be considered, with the semantic difference that in their autogenic end-member, we would call the fine-grained units inter-lobe elements rather than inter-lobes. Our usage is consistent with that of Prlat and Hodgson (2013) in their discussion of the implications of different possible interpretations of the fine-grained units within the hierarchy.

The annotation in Figure 2 deliberately differentiates between non-amalgamating scours, amalgamating scours and amalgamation surfaces. Our rationale for this differentiation is that all three represent erosion into the top of an element, but the erosion event responsible for an amalgamation surface is associated stratigraphically with the deposition of the overlying element, while for the two types of scours the erosion event is not followed directly by deposition above it. Hence scours may be overlain either by inter-element fine-grained units (a non-amalgamating scour) or by another element of the same hierarchical level deposited later (an amalgamating scour). An example of a decametre-wide non-amalgamating scour is evident in Figure 2c. This scour locally erodes the upper of the three lobe elements forming the lobe in the centre of the photo. These so-called megaflutes (Elliott, 2000) are common close to the tops of lobes in these deposits (Pyles 2007, Kane et al. 2009), and are evidence of flows bypassing transient topographic highs with coeval deposition in topographic lows elsewhere, perhaps associated with proximity to channel mouth and lobe transition zone (e.g. Macdonald et al. 2011). The scour is filled by fine-grained inter-lobe deposits, and the basal geometry of the overlying lobe, deposited significantly later when the top of the underlying lobe was no longer a topographic high impeding deposition, is not influenced by the scour beneath it. Hence this scour does not enhance vertical connectivity between lobes, as it is infilled by inter-lobe fines. A similar non-amalgamating scour at the same hierarchical level is recorded on the panels in Figure 2b, where it is distinguishable from amalgamating scours and amalgamation surfaces since these are overlain by lobe, rather than inter-lobe, deposits.

Amalgamating scours and amalgamation surfaces can be distinguished by their shape. Scours tend to

be much narrower than the overlying element and to truncate the underlying units more sharply, while amalgamation surfaces are more conformable with the deposits and often need to be traced considerable distances laterally to be recognised at all (e.g. Figure 2b).

The distinction between amalgamating scours and amalgamation surfaces may be significant for reservoir flow, as simple two-dimensional modelling has shown how the two types of amalgamation affect differently the overall connectivity of a sequence (Manzocchi et al. 2007). For simplicity, however, we do not differentiate between them in the quantitative parameterisation below, and the modelling described in this paper includes only amalgamation surfaces.

Parameterisation approach and parameter definitions

The processes leading to the hierarchical structure of lobe deposits and the arrangement of elements at individual levels in the hierarchy are reasonably well understood. This understanding has led to the high fidelity of surface-based models which codify these processes to recreate numerically the depositional order and geometry of the sequence of elements (e.g. Pyrcz et al. 2005, 2015). The modelling in this paper takes the more direct and traditional approach of inputting the geometrical properties of the deposits into the modelling algorithm to constrain the model output. The aim of the parameterisation described below, therefore, is to measure these properties from natural datasets to establish representative values for use in the modelling.

Two classes of data are discussed and collected at different hierarchical levels: dimensional data and stacking data. Dimensional data refer to the lengths, widths and thicknesses of elements within the hierarchy. Stacking data refer to the spatial distribution of elements within the larger-scale container. The main stacking data collected are element volume fractions and amalgamation ratios measured from vertical sample-lines through containers at different hierarchical levels. These parameters are spatial variables likely to decrease from the axial to fringe regions of the container

and therefore, the individual one-dimensional measurements are representative only of the location of the sample. A consideration of the distributions is required to obtain representative average values. Although channel elements can be an important component of lobe systems (e.g. Figure 2a) and are included in the models discussed later in the paper, the focus in this analysis is exclusively on lobes. The data presented here are a synthesis of the fuller analysis reported by Zhang (2015).

The hierarchical components of lobe deposits (lobe complexes, lobes, lobe elements, beds) are idealized as convex-up elliptical bodies (e.g. Deptuck et al., 2008; Prlat et al., 2009). Their length is defined as the greatest distance along the main paleoflow direction, and their width as the greatest distance perpendicular to this. Their thickness is defined by a representative value close to the centre of the object, and the objects thin towards their edges. Measurements of length and widths include existing measurements reported in the literature, new measurements made from figures published in the literature where the plan-view geometry of various hierarchical units are clearly shown, and new outcrop measurements from the Ross Formation in the west of Ireland. The thickness of lobe hierarchical components is locally variable, and the presence of amalgamation surfaces, which cannot always be identified in 1D logged sections, makes measurements of element thicknesses problematic, particularly at smaller, more heavily amalgamated, hierarchical levels. For lobes and lobe elements, 2D correlation panels (e.g. Prlat et al., 2009; Grundvg et al., 2014) or large-scale photomontages (e.g. Steyn, 2009) show a relatively low degree of amalgamation, with the lateral dimensions of amalgamations usually covering a small fraction of the total object length (e.g. Figure 2b). In these cases, both the object thickness and the amalgamation ratio have been measured directly from the published correlation panels and despite deriving from 2D panels the measurements are assumed to be representative of the 3D elements. Beds are more amalgamated, and it is difficult to estimate the thicknesses of individual beds from the amalgamated bed sets often present in the central parts of lobe elements (e.g. Figure 2c). When these amalgamated packages are traced laterally, it is clear that they comprise multiple amalgamated beds which separate towards the fringe regions of the lobe elements, however it is difficult to measure either the dimensions

(width, length, thickness) or amalgamation ratios of beds within the central amalgamated region of lobe elements. Because of this, the more reliable dimensional data derive from lobe complexes, lobes and lobe elements, and the bed thickness data include both individual beds as well as amalgamated bed sets.

Stacking is used as a term to describe the way in which the objects fill their container one hierarchical level larger. In a standard object-based model of a binary sand/shale system the net:gross ratio is the only stacking input data of interest. In the non-hierarchical compression based models of Manzocchi et al., (2007), the amalgamation ratio is also significant (e.g. Figure 1). For the hierarchical compression-based models considered here, it is necessary to define equivalent parameters at each hierarchical level. Net:gross ratio, by definition, refers to the proportion of net reservoir rock (i.e. sand in this case) present, and therefore conflates the volume of beds at the smallest hierarchical level, with the volume of fine units (inter-beds, inter-lobe elements and inter-lobes) at all hierarchical levels. From a hierarchical modelling perspective, therefore, the net: gross ratio is rather too complicated a measurement to use as model input. Instead, we use a hierarchical level specific parameter called the volume fraction, defined as the proportion of container that is occupied by objects one hierarchical level smaller.

In a non-hierarchical context, the amalgamation ratio is defined as the number of sand-on-sand bed bases as a proportion of the total number of sand bed bases observed on a 1D section (Chapin et al. 1994). This definition does not distinguish contacts between sand beds in the same lobe element from sand-sand contacts that occur across hierarchically larger erosive surfaces. Therefore, in this study, we use a hierarchical definition of amalgamation ratio to mean the proportion of object bases eroded into a lower object of the same hierarchical level, as a proportion of the total number of objects at the same level. Hence amalgamation of lobes, for example, requires erosion of the inter-lobe fine-grained unit initially overlying the lower lobe. In the non-hierarchical compression-based object modelling, net: gross and amalgamation ratio define the model input. In the hierarchical

version, the level-specific volume fractions and amalgamation ratios take the equivalent role.

Although not an input to the modelling algorithm, we have also measured the number of smaller objects present in the container at each hierarchical level as a third measure of the way in which the objects in the natural systems stack.

The procedure for calculating these stacking data is shown schematically in Figure 3. First, the fine-grained units and any amalgamation surfaces are interpreted in a hierarchical context (Fig 3a). Often this is only possible when the log is considered within the larger-scale 2D framework of the outcrop from which it is derived, by correlating along strike. Then, increasingly small hierarchical levels are extracted from the log. In the hypothetical example shown (Figure 3), two lobes are separated by an inter-lobe, and the volume fraction of the lobes within the lobe complex is 95% but the lobe amalgamation ratio is zero (Figure 3b). At the smaller level, lobe 1 comprises three unamalgamated lobe elements and has a volume fraction of 85% and an amalgamation ratio of zero (Figure 3c). The lower lobe comprises two amalgamated lobe elements and therefore has both a volume fraction and an amalgamation ratio of 100%. The five lobe elements in the log contain between one and four beds, with an overall volume fraction of 97%. Bed-scale amalgamation ratio ranges from 0% in the lowest three lobe elements to 50% in the highest one. The average bed-scale amalgamation within the lobe element is 25%, since two out of eight bed bases are amalgamated with lower beds.

Ignoring the hierarchical framework of the deposits results in the calculation of bulk net: gross and amalgamation ratios analogous to those compiled by Manzocchi et al. (2007). The bulk net: gross ratio within the lobe complex is 87% (Figure 3a), given by the product of all the component hierarchical volume fractions. Scaling between the hierarchical amalgamation ratios and the bulk value is more complex, since the bed-scale amalgamations dominate the bulk measurements as there are more beds in the sequence than larger objects. Hence the bulk amalgamation ratio is $\frac{3}{13} = 23\%$ (Figure 3a), comparable to the representative bed-scale value of 25%.

The procedure outlined above (Figure 3) relies on recognition of all amalgamation surfaces within the succession, but this is not always possible. Often, highly amalgamated bed sets are present towards the axes of lobe elements (e.g. Figure 2c), and although it is sometimes possible to recognize discontinuous remnant bedding surfaces in the highly amalgamated beds, it is impossible to reliably identify all amalgamation surfaces. In these situations, the amalgamation ratio has been estimated based on an assumed characteristic sandstone bed thickness. The estimation is approximate and ignores the possible presence of thickening up cycles (e.g. Macdonald et al. 2011), inclusion of which would lead to the calculation of slightly lower amalgamation ratios. The procedure is illustrated in Figure 4. Here, a lobe element comprises two unamalgamated sandstone beds at the bottom, each about 10cm thick, overlain by a 1.25m thick amalgamated bed package. Some lamination is evident in the thick amalgamated bed, but individual amalgamation surfaces cannot be counted. By assuming that the bed contains different numbers of amalgamation surfaces, the amalgamation ratio and the average sandstone bed thickness can be estimated (Figure 4c). The representative thickness of these beds is about 20 cm, implying that the thick amalgamated unit contains about 6 to 8 individual beds and that, overall, the lobe element has an amalgamation ratio of about 70%. Hence the stacking data for this lobe element at this particular location are a volume fraction of beds of 92%, an amalgamation ratio of 70%, and 9 individual objects.

Representative values of dimensional data (element widths, lengths and thicknesses) and stacking data (element volume fractions and amalgamation ratios) at each hierarchical level collected in this section, form the input to the reservoir-scale geomodel described later. The geomodel contains channels as well as lobe-shaped bodies at one of the hierarchical levels. These have been included to illustrate the versatility of the modelling method, and because feeder channels and channel-lobe transition zones are an integral part of a lobe complex. We do not, however, include channels in the quantitative analysis of natural data presented below, which focuses exclusively on the lobe-shaped bodies. The dimensions of channels have recently been analysed in relation to the dimensions of

their concomitant lobes (Pettinga et al. 2018), and the dimensions we have used in the models are compatible with the analysis of Pettinga et al.

Dimensional data

The dimensional data compiled in Figure 5 derive from 23 deep-water depositional systems and include data from outcrop studies (Lyons et al., 1994; Dutton et al., 2003; Haughton et al., 2009; Drinkwater and Pickering, 2001; Johnson et al. 2001; Sullivan et al., 2004; Pyles, 2007; Weislogel et al., 2007; Prlat et al., 2009; Steyn, 2009; Bernhardt et al., 2011; Figueiredo et al., 2010; Grundvg et al., 2014; Pyles et al., 2014; Zhang, 2015) and non-outcrop studies including reflection seismic surveys, side-scan sonar data and core / image log data (Milliman and Syvitski, 1992; Bruhn et al., 1998; Pfeiffer et al., 2000; Saller et al., 2008; Santos et al., 2000; Satur et al., 2000; Savoye et al., 2009; Zaragosi et al., 2000; Banonneau et al., 2002; Fonnesu et al., 2003; Fjellanger et al., 2005; Fugelli and Olsen, 2005; Gervais et al., 2006; Deptuck et al., 2008; Jegou et al., 2008; Normark et al., 2009; Smme et al., 2009; Abreu et al., 2010; Bourget et al., 2010; Hanquiez et al., 2010; Oluboyo et al., 2014). Taken together, we find that specific hierarchical components in different systems span approximately one order of magnitude scale-range, and that there is approximately half an order of magnitude difference in size between objects at different levels of the hierarchy. Hence lobe complexes are between 10 and 100 km long, lobes are between 3 and 30 km long, and lobe elements are between 1 and 10 km long (Figure 5a). Bed length data are scarce, but where available they too conform to this trend. For example, beds from central Spitsbergen are reported to be between 0.2 and 2 km long (Grundvg et al., 2014). The object width data (Figure 5b) follow a very similar pattern to the length data (Figure 5a), but the thickness data are more variable (Figure 5c). In particular, and despite the inclusion of amalgamated bed sets as well as individual beds in the dataset, there is a scale-break of approximately a whole order of magnitude between the thickness of beds and the thickness of lobe elements. At larger hierarchical levels the pattern of half an order

of magnitude scale transitions between levels, evident in the length and width data, is also present for object thicknesses.

It is useful to examine the aggregate distributions of object sizes from all sources (Figure 5), but a more nuanced appreciation of the scales and shapes of the objects is obtained when two dimensions are present for the same object (Figure 6a, b), and when multiple hierarchical levels of objects can be cross-plotted for particular lobe systems (Figure 6c; a similar approach was taken by Prlat et al. 2010). The plan-view aspect ratio of lobate objects is generally between 1 and 6, with mean length-to-width ratios of 1.5 for lobe elements, 2.5 for lobes and 1.8 for lobe complexes (Figure 6a). Cross-sectional aspect ratios are much more variable, with width-to-thickness ratios ranging between about 30 and 3000, with a general tendency for higher aspect ratios at smaller hierarchical levels (Figure 6b). The importance of sampling on the implied aspect ratios is evident when the width to thickness ratios of the different objects are plotted as a function of sampling types (Figure 7). The objects from the largest hierarchical level have similar aspect ratios for both outcrop and sub-surface datasets (Figure 7a), but for smaller objects (lobes, lobe elements) there is a general trend for outcrop datasets to have higher aspect ratios (Figure 7b, c). We think this difference is caused by the complementary effects of underestimating the widths of objects in outcrop data due to the practice of estimating their widths from object thinning ratios (e.g. Pyles, 2007), and of overestimating their thicknesses in seismic data due to limited vertical resolution.

For four systems (two outcrop, two subsurface), width and thickness data are available at three hierarchical scales (Figure 6c). Within the two outcrop datasets we find that the lobe elements measured in the Tanqua Karoo are a similar size and shape to the lobes measured in the Ross Formation. The lobes from the Golo and Kutai datasets have similar widths to those from the Ross Formation, but are about ten times thicker, perhaps reflecting sampling limitations in these two subsurface datasets relative to the outcrop datasets, in addition to geological differences related to degree of confinement (e.g. Prlat et al. 2010).

It is clear from this analysis of available dimensional data for lobe systems that there is a wide variation in size and shape of hierarchically equivalent components in different lobe systems, and that much of the variability, particularly at smaller levels, may be due to different data sources. Despite this, data from individual systems support the initial observation of steps in scale transitions between hierarchical components of approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ an order of magnitude (Figure 6c). It is interesting to note that there is overlap in scale between the sizes of objects of different hierarchical levels and therefore the data do not support either of the end-member scaling models of Straub and Pyles (2012), but instead fall somewhere between them. Overall, the four-fold hierarchy of lobe complex, lobe, lobe element and bed is able to describe the systems examined, but there is a scarcity of data at the bed level for beds to be included comprehensively in the scale cross-plots (Figure 6). The outcrop data show approximate self-similarity at the largest hierarchical levels, and lobe complexes, lobes and lobe elements all seem to have similar length: width and width: thickness aspect ratios. Based on the limited bed-scale data available, however, it seems that beds depart from this trend since they have much higher width: thickness aspect ratios than objects at the other two levels; a difference perhaps reflecting the difference in scale-specific depositional process discussed earlier.

The purpose of our analysis has been to get a sense of the ranges of sizes likely to be present at different levels in different natural systems, rather than to parameterize any particular system thoroughly. The dimensional data used later in this paper to condition the hierarchical compression based object models are representative of the systems examined but are not based on any particular system. A second important data type for conditioning the models consists of hierarchical stacking data, which are examined next.

Stacking data

Distributions of stacking data for 1D log sections from a variety of deep-water lobe systems are compiled in Figure 8. The volume fraction distributions (Figure 8a) are strongly skewed towards high values, with a median volume fraction for lobes of about 75% and for lobe elements and beds of about 95%. All three distributions show inflections at a cumulative frequency of between 10% (for beds) and 25% (for lobes). This can be attributed to the transition from high volume fractions of objects in a large proportion of the central area of the hierarchically larger object, to a relatively small fringe region with low volume fraction at the edges. Amalgamation ratio for lobes and lobe elements are generally very low, with only about 15% of both lobes and lobe elements, having any amalgamation whatsoever (Figure 8b). Beds are much more highly amalgamated than the hierarchically larger objects, and the bed dataset has a median amalgamation ratio of 70%. There is a sharp fall-off in the distribution for the least amalgamated 30% of the bed data, representing a region of the lobe element where the volume fraction of beds is still high but the beds are increasingly unamalgamated, and a fringe region of the lobe element where both the amalgamation ratio and volume fraction of beds are low. A cross-plot of volume fraction against amalgamation ratio at each hierarchical level (Figure 8c) shows a high level of variability, with a general trend of relatively more amalgamated objects at smaller hierarchical levels. The level-specific representative curves, for example, suggest that at a volume fraction of 80%, beds have an amalgamation ratio of about 40%, lobe elements of about 20%, and lobes are generally unamalgamated.

The stacking data suggest that a vertical sample-line through a lobe complex or a lobe generally samples three or four lobes or lobe elements respectively, although some can contain over 10 (Figure 8d). By contrast, a log through a characteristic lobe element contains between 8 and 16 beds. This departure from self-similarity between beds and lobe elements is comparable with the observation made earlier (Figure 5) that there is one order of magnitude difference in the average thickness of lobe elements and beds, but half an order of magnitude between lobes and lobe elements, and between lobe complexes and lobes. If they are relatively unamalgamated (like lobes

and lobe elements) then it is possible to fit about three objects locally into a container half an order of magnitude larger. If the objects are more amalgamated, and there is a whole order of magnitude difference in thickness between object and container (as is the case with beds) then it is possible to fit more than ten objects into the container. Hence the data in Figure 8 are entirely compatible with the scale gaps observed in Figure 5.

The dimensional and stacking data compiled for a range of natural lobe systems (Figs 5, 6, 8) provide constraining data for building hierarchical geomodels of lobe systems. For example, Figure 9 shows cross-sections through the centre of an idealized lobe complex or lobe (Figure 9a), and lobe elements (Figure 9b) containing objects one hierarchical level smaller with dimensional and stacking data representative of the median observed values. These cross-sections have been generated using the compression-based modelling method, which is explained in detail in the following section.

MODELLING PROCEDURES

Three-dimensional models of idealised sand bodies with simple shapes in an impermeable background facies similar to the cross-sections shown in Figure 1 were built using the compression algorithm by Manzocchi et al. (2007). The models were analysed in terms of sandstone connectivity, net: gross ratio, amalgamation ratio, sand body aspect ratio and sand body orientation distribution. The main objective of Manzocchi et al. (2007) was to examine the effects of faults on modifying sand body connectivity, and the work focused on the interactions between sedimentary and fault geometries rather than specifically on sedimentary architecture. Subsequently we have implemented a recursive algorithm within the compression-based modelling code to allow us to build large-scale geological models at the resolution of beds, with the higher hierarchical levels governing increasingly larger scales of sedimentological architecture. Background to the compression algorithm and details of the hierarchical implementation are provided in this section. In

the next section, the approach is tested using representative parameters at a scale relevant to practical reservoir production modelling.

The Compression algorithm

The compression algorithm allows models with independent, user-defined net: gross and amalgamation ratios to be built, by including a geometrical transformation to the modelling grid as part of the modelling process (Figure 10). The transformation is based on the assumption that the amalgamation ratio of an object-based model is equal to its net: gross ratio. This assumption is correct if all beds are the same thickness (Manzocchi et al. 2007) but tends to overestimate the amalgamation ratio of object-based models containing a wide range of object thicknesses. Results discussed later indicate that the assumption produces reasonable results for the realistic object thickness ranges used in the model in this paper.

In the first step of the algorithm, a model with net: gross ratio equal to the model target amalgamation ratio is generated (Figure 10a). In the second step, the thickness of all cells containing sand are scaled by a factor E_1 , and of all cells containing shale by a factor E_0 (Figure 10b). In practice, $E_1 > 1$ and $E_0 < 1$, implying that the shale cells are compressed relative to the sandstone cells, which are expanded. This operation is accompanied by grid manipulations to ensure stratigraphic continuity at the edges of objects (this is why the rectangular sand beds in Figure 10b have tapered edges), and therefore the operation does not affect the connectivity of the model objects. All shale interbeds are preserved and, although individual shale beds are thinner, the network of shale has exactly the same topological characteristics as it did in the original model. Hence, the transformed model (Figure 10b) now has both the target net: gross ratio and the target amalgamation ratio. The original object-based model is built with appropriately scaled bed thicknesses so that the transformation, which thickens the beds, results in them having their target thickness values. Note that the high-frequency perturbations in layer height (Figure 10b) are an inevitable artefact of the algorithm. As the models shown later in the paper demonstrate, these perturbations become

insignificant when models of systems with realistic body aspect ratios are examined without vertical exaggeration.

The ratio between the two scaling factors (E_0 and E_1) is referred to by Manzocchi et al. (2007) as the compression factor (c_F), and is given by:

$$c_F = \frac{E_0}{E_1} = \frac{1-NTG^{-1}}{1-AR^{-1}},$$

where NTG are AR are net: gross and amalgamation ratios respectively. If $c_F = 1$, then there is no difference between the final (Figure 10b) and initial (Figure 10a) models, and in this case $NTG = AR$ (e.g. Figure 1d). Systems with progressively lower amalgamation ratio for a particular net: gross ratio can be generated with progressively lower values of c_F , and curves of equal c_F on a plot of amalgamation ratio versus net: gross ratio appear to approximately demarcate different deep-water systems (Manzocchi et al., 2007, Figure 1). Curves of equal c_F have also been plotted in Figure 8c, to find representative hierarchical values. The compression factor, therefore, is both a useful means of discriminating between systems with different associations between volume fraction and amalgamation ratio, and a useful modelling parameter controlling the compression-based modelling approach.

The Compression algorithm for two object types

The compression algorithm, as described above, was developed for a single hierarchical level of a single type of object (Manzocchi et al 2007). In the present work, this has been modified to include up to two types of object at each hierarchical level, for example poorly amalgamated lobe elements and more erosive channels. To do this, separate scaling factors (E_1 and E_2) are used for the two types of object, resulting in different stacking patterns overall. Idealised cross-sections are used to illustrate the approach (Figure 11). The three models all have the same dimensional characteristics (width, height) of both object types, and identical stacking characteristics (volume fraction, amalgamation ratio) of the yellow objects. The difference is in the way the green objects have been

modelled. The green volume fraction is the same in all three models, but different scaling factors have been used which results in different object-specific amalgamation ratios. In Figure 11a, a scaling factor of 1 is used for the green objects resulting in frequent erosion of yellow by green, as well as more frequent green-on-green amalgamation. In Figure 11b, the same scaling factor is used for both object types, which therefore have the same levels of compensational stacking. In Figure 11c, the green objects have a greater scaling factor than the yellow ones and hence are much more compensationally stacked. The examples show how choice of object-specific scaling factor (and hence of the thickness and volume fraction of the objects in the initial, pre-compression object-based models shown at the base of Figure 11) can result in models conditioned to different conceptual geological models.

Hierarchical compression-based modelling

The hierarchical modelling approach was designed with the objective of generating models capable of including geologically realistic connectivity arising from bed truncations below, and onlap above larger-scale erosion surfaces. A hierarchy of grids is used to achieve this, and these grids are eventually combined into a single pillar grid that forms the input to the flow simulator. This grid (and its associated transmissibility files, which are discussed below) is the final output of the compression-based modelling code. In this work we use the Eclipse 100 simulator and the GRDECL format. All grids used in the modelling are stored in a conventional pillar grid structure and have vertical pillars and square cells. The same pillar locations are used at all hierarchical levels, and hence smaller hierarchical scales have grids that are refined vertically but not horizontally. The different grids, and how they are constructed, are described with reference to a simple two-dimensional cross-sectional model (figs 12, 13). The description in this section is focussed on the modelling procedure, so object sizes and model scales have been selected to highlight the process rather than to represent realistic geological stacking.

Initially, the largest objects are modelled within a single compressed grid (Figure 12a), subject to user-defined dimensional and stacking characteristics in the manner described above. Each object is then processed in turn. First a refined grid is constructed based on the idealised geometry of the object, and is populated with smaller objects based on the scale-specific instructions (e.g. Figs 12b, c). This grid is then transformed to fit exactly within the volume occupied by the object in the larger-scale model (e.g. Figs 12d, e). In the case of an object that has not been eroded and is therefore entirely preserved in the large model (e.g object 1, Figure 12a), this involves locally rescaling the height of the object, and ensuring that onlaps at the object margin and base are preserved (Figure 12d). In the case of objects that are partially eroded by other objects in the larger model (e.g. Object 2, Figure 12a), the initial model is built based on the object geometry prior to erosion (Figure 12c), and the transformation retains only the non-eroded portion of the object, resulting in the preservation of truncated, smaller-scale beds below hierarchically larger erosional surfaces (Figure 12e). This figure is designed to show the method rather than realistic geology, but the versatility of the approach can be appreciated by examination of the cross-sections shown in Figure 9, which include geologically constrained stacking and dimensional data and derive from this point part of the modelling workflow.

The procedure is applied to all objects in the large-scale models resulting in a hierarchical, compressed, object-based model (e.g. Figure 13a), which is eventually transformed to a standard format pillar grid for inclusion in flow simulation software. The hierarchical object-based model contains a set of nested grids (Figure 13b), the edges and corners of which are referenced to the edges and corners of the objects in the hierarchically larger grid (Figure 13c), according to the procedure discussed above. A deliberate feature of the modelling is the preservation of truncations below, and onlaps above, erosional boundaries. Where truncations lie under onlaps, connections are created between beds in different, hierarchically larger objects (e.g. Figure 13a,e). Use of different grids for each object allows multiple connections between beds within the area of a single stack of cells. For example, the sandstone bed labelled A in Figure 13e onlaps onto an erosional surface and

connects with two underlying truncated sandstone beds underneath it (Beds B and C). Preservation of these connections in the simulation grid (Figure 13d, f) relies on non-neighbour connections, using the procedure described below.

Structure of the simulation grid model

It is impossible to submit the hierarchy of grids produced by the compression-based object modelling code directly to the flow simulator. Therefore it is necessary to combine them into a single grid with a standard format. There are, conceptually, many possible ways of combining the grids, and in this study we have applied the simplest possible method which will result in the fewest cells in the combined model (Figure 13d), while retaining fully the geometrical heterogeneities present in the detailed geomodel (Figure 13a, b). The main assumption in the approach is that all sand cells are assigned constant values of porosity and permeability, and all shale cells are impermeable. Heterogeneity in these models therefore results only from the geometrical characteristics of the three-dimensional network of sands.

In the grid combination method, each stack of cells is processed independently. Figure 13f shows a detail of the simulation model derived from the compression-based model for the same area in Figure 13e: these figures are used to explain the method. All cells in each object grid in the compressed model are conformable, and if two or more cells containing the same facies directly overly one another, they are merged into a single cell. For example, Cells D and E (Figure 13f) derive from two shale cells and four sandstone cells respectively (Figure 13e). Merged cell stacks from different object grids are combined into a single cell stack, and where there is no amalgamation between objects, this results in conformable cells with no gaps. However, unconformable cells can be present at contacts between object grids in the compressed model (Figure 13b). The detailed geometry of these contacts (e.g. Figure 13e) cannot be represented explicitly in the geometry of the

output pillar grid, since cell corners in a pillar grid can only lie along the pillars and no overlapping cells are allowed. They can, however, be represented implicitly in the model using non-neighbour connections. The following procedure is applied to manage these contacts. First, the lowest overlapping cells above the unconformity, and the highest truncated cell below it (e.g. cells A and C in Figure 13e) are stretched to corners of the cells stack at the corners where they are not present, and placed at the depth of the unconformity (Figure 13f). All other incomplete cells are also stretched to these positions (e.g. the upper portion of cell B, the shale layers between cells B and C, and the shale layers overlying cells A). This results in a conformable output grid with a conventional structure acceptable by the flow simulator, but with the wrong connections across the unconformity, since it has been forced to become conformable (Figure 13f). This must therefore be corrected using explicit definitions of connection transmissibilities. Use of transmissibility multipliers and non-neighbour connection transmissibilities is generally associated with faulted flow simulation models (e.g. Manzocchi et al. 1999, 2008), but a similar approach has been applied to represent in the flow simulation model the complex geometries across unconformities, which is explained below.

The transmissibility between two cells governs flow rate in a simulation model, and is proportional to the connection area between the cells. Hence the transmissibility between cells A and C in the simulation model (Figure 13f) is too high, as both cells have been stretched across the entire connection area to produce the conformable output grid. This transmissibility can be corrected by use of a transmissibility multiplier with a value given by the ratio between the connection area in the compression model (Figure 13e) and in the simulation model (Figure 13f). In some cases, this multiplier is equal to zero if a connection is created in the simulation model that is not present in the compression model (e.g. the connection between cells F and H). Sometimes, the situation arises when connections are present in the compression model that are not present in the simulation model (e.g. between cells B and A or between cells H and G, Figure 13e). These can be added to the simulation model as vertical non-neighbour connections with transmissibilities calculated as a function of the cell thickness, cell permeabilities, and area of truncation in the high-resolution grids.

As described, each stack of cells is treated independently, resulting in different numbers of cells in each cell stack. The number of layers in the final pillar-grid model is determined by the cell-stack containing the greatest number of layers, and all other stacks have inactive zero thickness cells at their base to ensure a standard grid structure. This means that there is no correspondence between layers in the output grid and stratigraphic position. Despite this, flow units align horizontally across cell stacks (Figure 13d, f), and the simulator does not discriminate between neighbour and non-neighbour connections when calculating transmissibilities between overlapping grid cells. Connections from one cell into multiple cells in the same direction (e.g. cell E to cells J and K; Figure 13f) are recognised by the simulator, although with some inaccuracies in transmissibility (Islam and Manzocchi, 2017). Hence this procedure, while simplifying the stratigraphy to a binary distribution of sandstone and shale layers, retains the three-dimensional structure of the model through the use of transmissibility multipliers and non-neighbour connections. In the following section, the method is applied to generate a geologically realistic succession at a scale relevant to reservoir development modelling, using parameters representative of the natural dimensional and stacking data described in the previous section.

HIERARCHICAL LOBE MODEL

The previous sections of this paper have described quantitatively the hierarchical arrangement of objects within deep-water lobe deposits, and has outlined a method capable of honouring these dimensional and stacking characteristics in scale-specific object-based geomodelling. Crucially, this new compression-based modelling approach is able to output models with the high volume fractions and low amalgamation ratios characteristic of the larger scales of the hierarchy. This approach explicitly preserves the thin but continuous fine-grained units which represent the key heterogeneities for flow in these sequences. This section describes an idealized reservoir-scale model built using the approach. The model is based on a real reservoir, but is constrained to

representative hierarchical dimensional and stacking data rather than reservoir-specific data. The model dimensions are 4.5 km by 3.2 km horizontally, with cells 100 m x 100 m wide. The thickness of the succession modelled is ca. 250 m (Figure 14a), and in the geomodel, cells containing sandstone are 5 cm thick. Cells containing fine-grained interbeds are much thinner than this as a consequence of the compression algorithm. Vertically adjoining sandstone cells are merged together in the output flow simulation grid, resulting in an approximately log-normal distribution of sandstone cell thicknesses with a median value of about 20 cm.

The input to the modelling (Figure 14b) is a pillar-grid format zonation consisting of 29 discrete zones, which are included deterministically. This zonation has been constructed from analysis of the reservoir well data and correlated throughout the model volume. Most of these zones represent individual lobe and inter-lobe units, but one of them represents an inter-lobe complex condensed sequence, since the modelled volume has been interpreted to comprise an upper lobe complex consisting of four lobes, and a lower one consisting of 12 lobes. The largest two levels of the hierarchy considered in this paper, therefore, are included deterministically in the final model, but the two smaller levels (lobe elements and beds) are modelled stochastically, using the compression-based object modelling approach.

The approach is illustrated initially through a series of cross-sections through a single 10m thick zone representing a single lobe (Figure 14b). The settings for dimensional and stacking characteristics used to model this zone are reported in Table 1. Different settings have been used to define the characteristics of each zone in the model in accordance with the conceptual geological model of the reservoir, and some of the inter-lobes also contain small volume fractions of poorly amalgamated sheet sands. First, a set of lobe elements are modelled within the lobe (Figure 14c, g). These occupy a large volume fraction of the lobe, but are strongly compensationally stacked, a characteristic modelled with the compression method by using an amalgamation ratio substantially lower than the volume fraction, as is appropriate at this hierarchical level (Table 1). As well as lobe elements, feeder

channels are also included in the model at this hierarchical level. The channel objects are built using a different geometrical template to the sheet-like lobe objects (Fig 14d), and one of them is intersected three times by the cross-section (Fig 14g). The conceptual model for the channels is that they are more erosive than the lobe elements and so a different scaling factor has been applied for this facies, as explained previously. The erosive nature of the channel is evident in the model cross-section (Figure 14 g, i).

In the next step of the modelling, each lobe element and channel element is populated with hierarchically smaller objects (i.e. beds; Fig 14e, f). In accordance with the observations from natural systems, they have high volume fractions and higher amalgamation ratios than the larger objects (Table 1). The result (Figure 14h) is a complex, high net: gross package of sandstone units and more or less continuous fine-grained units representing interbed and inter-lobe element deposits, with connectivity between sandstone beds controlled by hierarchical bed-scale and lobe element-scale amalgamations. The sandstone beds in the channel are modelled with different dimensional and stacking characteristics to those in the lobe elements (Table 1), and in this cross-section (Figure 14h, i) there is good communication between the channel sandstone beds and those in the lobe element. This is because the channel sandstone beds are allowed to onlap the edges of the channel element, providing good connectivity where the channel element truncates beds in the eroded lobe element.

As well as shown qualitatively on the cross-sections, the hierarchical stacking characteristics within the lobe are shown quantitatively on element and bed resolution maps (Fig 14j - m). The target element volume fraction is 92% (84% for lobe elements plus 8% for channel elements; Table 1), which is the same as the mean volume fraction within the model. The locations of the channels stand out on the map as regions of high element volume fraction (Fig 14j), a result of the channels being more erosive and generally thicker than the lobe elements. In accordance with the target model (Table 1), element amalgamations are rare. Over much of the area all lobe elements are

664 unamalgamated, but locally the element-scale amalgamation ratio can be as high as 60% (Fig 14k).
665 The centre of the cross-section (Fig 12g) passes through one of these highly amalgamated regions.
666 Here, three amalgamating (the channel and the two lobe elements beneath it) and three non-
667 amalgamating (the uppermost and two lowermost lobe elements) element bases combine to
668 provide a local element amalgamation ratio of 50% (Fig 12g). At other positions in the cross-section
669 (e.g. at both ends) the amalgamation ratio is zero.

670 The bed-scale maps show the total net sand fraction (i.e. net: gross ratio, Fig 12l) and bulk
671 amalgamation ratio (Fig 12m) of the lobe, and bed-scale amalgamation surfaces as shown on the
672 cross-section in Fig 12i. The mean net: gross ratio is 81%, resulting from the different contribution of
673 beds in the lobe and channel elements (Table 1). The mean amalgamation ratio is 48%. This is close
674 to the target bed-scale amalgamation ratios of 40% in the lobe elements and 50% in channel
675 elements (Table 1), indicating that the procedures and assumptions in the method result in model
676 realisations with stacking characteristics close to the input target values.

677 The width-to-thickness aspect ratios of lobes and lobe elements are of the order of 300:1 (Figures
678 6,7), and of beds are even higher. Therefore, model cross-sections must be highly vertically
679 exaggerated to see the lateral geometries associated with boundaries of individual objects. For
680 example, Figure 14c is exaggerated by about 100:1, and the two parts of Figure 15, which shows all
681 29 zones of the model, by about 20:1 and 10:1. This degree of vertical exaggeration allows an
682 appreciation of the extremely layered nature of these modelled units, with well-connected fine-
683 grained facies providing lateral as well as vertical barriers or baffles to flow between the generally
684 better-connected sandstone beds within the lobe elements. The deterministic inter-lobe and inter-
685 lobe complex units are generally continuous throughout the model volume (there is one position in
686 the model where lobe-on-lobe amalgamation has been included as part of the input grid), and
687 represent the most significant heterogeneities in the model. The hierarchically smaller fine-grained

deposits, which are modelled stochastically, fit extremely well into this larger-scale framework and the overall resultant model appears very realistic.

Examination of highly vertically exaggerated images are required to see the complex architectures of these models of hierarchical lobe deposits, but views without vertical exaggeration are needed to compare the models with outcrop photos. In Figure 16, a portion of the model is compared to a cliff section of the Annot sandstone lobe deposits at the same scale (Collins et al. 2015). There is a close qualitative correspondence between the outcrop and the model. Without vertical exaggeration the lateral margins of the hierarchical objects are invisible, and the main characteristic evident is of apparently layer-cake stratigraphy. The succession has very strong vertical variability at the meter to decametre scale, between regions of high and low net: gross ratio, with sections of high and low amalgamation within the high net: gross regions, all interbedded with fine-grained units of varying thickness.

The 3D geological model consists of 16 individual model zones input deterministically and modelled separately. An average zone contains about 30 lobe elements or channel elements, modelled stochastically. Each of these objects is then represented as an independent geomodel grid during the placement of individual beds. The full, 3D geomodel (Figure 15) therefore consists of about 500 individual model grids linked by reference to their positions in 16 larger-scale grid models. The inter-bed fine-grained units are represented explicitly in the smallest-scale grids, the inter-element fines are represented explicitly in the larger grids, and the largest scale inter-lobe and inter-lobe complex units are represented as layers in the deterministic input grid. The method used to combine these grids into a single standard format pillar grid for input into a flow simulator has been described earlier. The output model (Figure 17) contains about 1.2 million active cells and about 1600 layers (a maximum of 50% of the layers are active in any cell stack since only sand cells are permeable). The model is easily flow simulated on a mid-range desk-top computer, and the results of a water-flood from four water injectors at the model corners towards a producer at the model centre show a

strongly heterogeneous sweep pattern reflecting the variable connectivity and tortuosity of flow paths within the model (Figure 17b). Examination of the water-flood performance with reference to the sedimentary hierarchy of the model (Figure 18) shows that despite the inclusion of the impermeable inter-beds, the most significant changes in water saturation (Figure 18a,c) and production-induced reservoir pressure (Figure 18b, d) occur across inter-lobe and inter-lobe element deposits, with the inter-beds only rarely representing significant production barriers. The high amalgamation ratios of the beds have resulted in good connectivity within lobe elements, and the hierarchically larger scales of object are more significant heterogeneities. This result accords with sensitivity studies identifying the predominant importance of hierarchically larger scales of amalgamation on sweep efficiency and recovery factors (e.g. Wu et al. 2012, Hofstra et al. 2016). Overall, the model satisfies our objective of determining whether the new hierarchical compression-based object modelling code is able to produce realistic looking reservoir-scale models with bed-scale heterogeneity (e.g. Figure 14, 15, 16), and output them to a flow simulator without loss of resolution (Figure 17, 18).

DISCUSSION

In the flow simulation model, all active cells have identical properties, and none of the natural variability and small-scale property trends observed in lobe deposits (e.g. Marchand et al. 2015, Jones et al. 2015) are included. Instead, the heterogeneous flow behaviour arises as a consequence of large-scale connectivity between the different flow units, which are represented either explicitly in the geometry of the grid, or by using non-neighbour connection transmissibilities. This approach contrasts with standard modelling approaches used for this type of reservoir, in which a facies-based modelling approach in a regular grid is used, and the challenge is to represent the heterogeneous reservoir behaviour using cell-based petrophysical properties (e.g. Hempton et al. 2005; Fitzsimmons et al. 2005, Labourdette et al. 2008). Deepwater lobe sequences are often subdivided into three (or

four if the thickest fine-grained units are considered separately) distinct facies associations (e.g. Hempton et al. 2005, Pringle et al. 2010, Kilhams et al. 2012, Bakke et al. 2013, Eldrett et al. 2015, Jones et al. 2015). These are: (1) highly amalgamated meter-plus thick sandstone units, (2) heterolithic but still high net: gross units comprising more or less amalgamated beds tens of centimetres to a meter thick, (3) low net-gross regions of unamalgamated thin-bedded sandstones, and (4) hemipelagic mudstones units representing the thicker, hierarchically larger, fine-grained units. The first three of these facies arise in our compression-based modelling spontaneously, as the placement of beds within lobe elements using the stacking and dimensional data appropriate for this hierarchical level, results in the characteristic spatial bed distributions illustrated in Figure 9b. Hence regions at the centres of lobe elements comprise highly amalgamated sandstones; this is the first facies. Laterally, these become less amalgamated and transition into the second, and subsequently the third, facies (Figure 9b). Lobe elements are stacked within lobes (Figure 9a), and a consequence of the compensationally stacked nature of these objects is that often similar regions of lobe elements overly one another, separated by thin inter-lobe element deposits. The fringe regions of lobes are likely to contain mainly the low amalgamation fringe regions of lobe elements (Figure 9b) and similarly, the fringes of lobes may often overly other lobe fringe regions. Therefore, 1D samples may intersect poor quality facies over thicknesses much greater than the thickness of individual lobe elements, before abruptly transitioning into much better quality facies. An absence of a strong vertical correlation structure, and the abrupt transition between variable thickness regions of particular facies, are therefore a key characteristic of this strongly hierarchical model as well as many outcrops.

Although based on an entirely different modelling premise, our model is therefore compatible with a facies-based approach, and the three different sandstone facies (thin-bedded, heterolithic and amalgamated) can be identified on the basis of the thickness of the cells in the output model (Figure 17c). Thickness thresholds of 30 cm and 1.2 m have been used to distinguish between these cells containing the different facies (Figure 17c). Individual sandstone beds in the model have a thickness

of between 10 and 40 cm, with a mean value of 20cm (Table 1) and hence the thin-bedded facies, which represents 14% by volume of the net portion of the reservoir, principally comprises regions of unamalgamated beds. The volumetrically most significant facies in the model is the heterolithic facies which occupies 50% of the net volume, while the amalgamated facies occupies 36% of the net volume.

Simulated oil recovery (Figure 17b) can be seen to correlate closely to these facies descriptors, with the amalgamated facies generally well swept, the thin-bedded facies generally unswept, and the heterolithic facies showing variable sweep depending on their large scale context within the model. Overall, the proportions and distribution of facies deduced from the compression-based object model (Figure 17c) are quite similar to those present in facies models of these kinds of sequences (e.g. Collins et al. 2015, Jones et al. 2015), but with one crucial distinction: in our model all fine-grained units are represented explicitly in the model, rather than forming part of the facies definitions. Therefore, while it is possible to derive facies identifiers from our model as we have done in Figure 17c, it is impossible from a facies model to derive the detailed network of fine-grained units that represent the main heterogeneities in this type of reservoir. These fine-grained units in the model are continuous over distances far exceeding the transitions between different facies (Figure 17c), consistent with long-held understanding of the scaling of fine-grained units in deep-water environments (e.g. Weber, 1986). It is well known that heterogeneities with length-scales exceeding tens of grid-blocks in length (like the fine-grained facies in these sequences) cannot be represented successfully in flow models if their effects are averaged into grid-block properties as representative properties. This is because the volume over which this representative property is appropriate far exceeds the length-scales of interest within the reservoir model (e.g. King 2007). Therefore, they must be represented explicitly in the simulation model, a consideration that has guided our compression-based modelling endeavours from the outset (e.g. Manzocchi et al., 2007). Despite this, it is important to appreciate that the flow model presented here (Figure 17) is the most heterogeneous possible output from the geological model (Figure 15), because all the fine-grained

units are impermeable in this version. In a more realistic model, for the reasons discussed earlier in the paper, the interbeds, inter-lobe element, inter-lobe and inter-lobe complex fine-grained units (which are all represented explicitly in the geological model) may be permeable to different degrees, and therefore a more realistic flow model might include some of these hierarchical fine-grained units as individual grid-cells with appropriate non-zero poro-perm properties. This would obviously result in less heterogeneous sweep behaviour overall, but the sensitivity to such behaviour is beyond the scope of this paper.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has examined geological and methodological aspects associated with the representation of realistic small-scale heterogeneity in reservoir models of deep-water lobe deposits. These sequences can have high net: gross ratios but low amalgamation ratios, a combination that is impossible to model using conventional object-based modelling approaches. A new compression-based object modelling approach allows input of these two ratios as independent conditioning parameters, and has been adapted to deal with the hierarchical arrangement of beds, lobe elements, lobes and lobe complexes characteristic of deep-water lobe deposits. Dimensional and stacking measurements from deep-water systems have been compiled from the literature. There show about half an order of magnitude difference between the sizes (width, length and thickness) of the three largest hierarchical levels considered, and a larger scale gap to beds. Lobes and lobe elements typically fill about 70% of the hierarchically larger elements in which they are contained, and have amalgamation ratios lower than 10%. The remaining volume is occupied by fine-grained inter-lobe and inter-lobe element deposits. Beds generally occupy about 80% of the volume of lobe elements (interbeds occupy the remainder), and are strongly amalgamated (ca. 50%).

New, recursive compression-based hierarchical modelling code has been developed and applied successfully to model an idealized reservoir succession at a full-field scale, constrained by parameters representative of each level. The resultant model is entirely compatible with facies descriptors generally used to parameterize these sequences when a facies-based modelling approach is used.

The model has been output without loss of resolution into a format suitable for a conventional flow simulator, and a simple water-flood simulation illustrates the controlling behaviour of the depositional hierarchy on flow. The flow model examined represents an end-member in which all fine-grained units are impermeable and therefore one in which the influence of geometry on flow is maximized. Where there is a strong contrast between the properties of the beds and of the inter-bed fine-grained units, the large horizontal correlation lengths present in these sequences imply that an explicit representation of the fine-grained units is necessary to model their effects on sweep and tortuous flow, which cannot be adequately captured within the properties of cells in a more conventional facies-based model of deep-water lobe sequences.

Acknowledgements

The approach and standalone code used to build the hierarchical compression-based object models were developed during the FIFT II joint industry project, funded by BG, BP, ConocoPhillips, Shell, Statoil and Total (as they were then). Leifu Zhang's PhD was funded by the China Scholarship Council (CSC) and University College Dublin, and the large model was built during an internship he spent at the Equinor Research Centre. Schlumberger are thanked for provision of academic licenses of Petrel, used here for visualization purposes, and of Eclipse 100, used for the flow modelling. David Hodgson and an anonymous reviewer are thanked for constructive comments.

837 References

- 838 Abreu, C. J., C. J. Appi, F. G. Silva, R. S. Matos, and L. Borghi, 2010, Depositional Evolution Of
839 Turbidite Lobe Complex In 2D High-Resolution Seismic: IV Simpósio Brasileiro de Geofísica.
- 840 Amy L. A., Peachey S. A., Gardiner A. R., Pickup G. E., Mackay E., and Stephen, K. D. Recovery
841 efficiency from a turbidite sheet system: numerical simulation of waterflooding using outcrop-based
842 geological models. *Petroleum Geoscience* 19, 123-138.
- 843 Bakke, K., I. A. Kane, O. J. Martinsen, S. A. Petersen, T. A. Johansen, S. Hustoft, F. H. Jacobsen, and A.
844 Groth, 2013, Seismic modelling in the analysis of deep-water sandstone termination styles: AAPG
845 Bulletin, v. 97, p. 1395-1419.
- 846 Bernhardt, A., Z. R. Jobe, and D. R. Lowe, 2011, Stratigraphic evolution of a submarine channel–lobe
847 complex system in a narrow fairway within the Magallanes foreland basin, Cerro Toro Formation,
848 southern Chile: *Marine & Petroleum Geology*, v. 28, p. 785-806.
- 849 Bourget, J., S. Zaragosi, S. Ellouz-Zimmermann, E. Ducassou, M. A. Prins, T. Garlan, V. Lanfumey, J. L.
850 Schneider, P. Rouillard, and J. Giraudeau, 2010, Highstand vs. lowstand turbidite system growth in
851 the Makran active margin: Imprints of high-frequency external controls on sediment delivery
852 mechanisms to deep water systems: *Marine Geology*, v. 274, p. 187-208.
- 853 Bruhn, C., A. Barroso, M. Lopes, D. Sarzenski, C. Abreu, and C. Silva, 1998, High-resolution
854 Stratigraphy and Reservoir Heterogeneities of Upper Albian Turbidite Reservoirs of Albacora Field,
855 Campos Basin, Offshore Brazil: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Annual Convention,
856 Salt Lake City, Utah.
- 857 Chapin, M. A., Davies, P., Gibson, J., and H. S. Pettingill, 1994, Reservoir architecture of turbidite
858 sheet sandstones in laterally extensive outcrops, Ross Formation, western Ireland, *in* P. Weimer, A. H.
859 Bouma, and B. F. Perkins, eds., *Submarine fans and turbidite systems: Sequence stratigraphy*,

860 reservoir architecture and production characteristics: Gulf Coast Section SEPM 15th Annual Research
861 Conference, p. 53–68.

862 Chapin M, Tiller G, 2007. Synthetic seismic modelling of turbidite outcrops, *in* T. H. Nilsen, R. D. Shew,
863 G. S. Steffens, and J. R. J. Studlick, eds., *Atlas of deepwater outcrops*, v. 56 p. 21-25.

864 Collins J., Kenyon-Roberts S., Cullen B., White J., Bordas-Le Floch N., Downey J. 2015. Arran Field: a
865 complex heterolithic reservoir on the margins of the Forties Fan System. In: McKie, T., Rose, P. T. S.,
866 Hartley, A. J., Jones, D. W. & Armstrong, T. L. (eds) *In: Tertiary Deep-Marine Reservoirs of the North*
867 *Sea Region*. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 403, 185-217.

868 Cosentino L. 2001. *Integrated reservoir studies*. Editions Technip, Paris. 310 pp.

869 Cullis S., Colombera L., Patacci M., McCaffrey W. D. 2018. Hierarchical classifications of the
870 sedimentary architecture of deep-marine depositional systems. *Earth-Science Reviews* 179, 38-71.

871 Deptuck, M. E., D. J. Piper, B. Savoye, and A. Gervais, 2008, Dimensions and architecture of late
872 Pleistocene submarine lobes off the northern margin of East Corsica: *Sedimentology*, v. 55, p. 869-
873 898.

874 Deutsch C. V., and Wang L. Hierarchical object-based stochastic modeling of fluvial reservoirs.
875 *Mathematical Geology* 28, 857-880.

876 Drinkwater, N. J., and K. T. Pickering, 2001, Architectural elements in a high-continuity sand-prone
877 turbidite system, Late Precambrian Kongsfjord Formation, Northern Norway: application to
878 hydrocarbon reservoir characterization: *Aapg Bulletin*, v. 85, p. 1731-1757.

879 Dutton, S. P., W. A. Flanders, and M. D. Barton, 2003, Reservoir characterization of a Permian deep-
880 water sandstone, East Ford field, Delaware basin, Texas: *AAPG bulletin*, v. 87, p. 609-627.

881 Eldrett J., Tripsanas E., Davis C., McKie T., Vierira M., Osterloff | P., Sandison T. 2015.
882 Sedimentological evolution of Sele Formation deep-marine depositional systems of the Central

883 North Sea. In: McKie, T., Rose, P. T. S., Hartley, A. J., Jones, D. W. & Armstrong, T. L. (eds) In: Tertiary
 884 Deep-Marine Reservoirs of the North Sea Region. Geological Society, London, Special Publications,
 885 403, 63–98.

886 Elliott, T., 2000, Depositional architecture of a sand-rich, channelized turbidite system: The Upper
 887 Carboniferous Ross Sandstone Formation, western Ireland, *in* P. Weimer, R. M. Slatt, J. Coleman, N. C.
 888 Rossen, H. Nelson, A. H. Bouma, M.J. Styzen, and D. T. Lawrence, eds., Deep-water reservoirs of the
 889 world: Gulf Coast Section SEPM 20th Annual Perkins Research Conference, p. 342–373.

890 Figueiredo, J. J., D. M. Hodgson, S. S. Flint, and J. P. Kavanagh, 2010, Depositional environments and
 891 sequence stratigraphy of an exhumed Permian mudstone-dominated submarine slope succession,
 892 Karoo Basin, South Africa: *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, v. 80, p. 97-118.

893 Fitzsimmons R., Veiberg G., Krakenes, T, 2005. Characterization of the Heimdal Sandstones within
 894 Alveim, Quads 24 and 25, Norwegian North Sea. In: Dore, A. G. & Vining, B. A. (eds) *Petroleum*
 895 *Geology: North-West Europe and Global Perspectives—Proceedings of the 6th Petroleum Geology*
 896 *Conference*, 123–131.

897 Fjellanger, E., F. Surlyk, L. C. Wamsteeker, and T. Midtun, 2005, Upper Cretaceous basin-floor fans in
 898 the Vøring Basin, Mid Norway shelf: *Norwegian Petroleum Society Special Publications*, v. 12, p. 135-
 899 164.

900 Fonnesu, F., 2003, 3D seismic images of a low-sinuosity slope channel and related depositional lobe
 901 (West Africa deep-offshore): *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, v. 20, p. 615-629.

902 Fugelli, E. M. G., and T. R. Olsen, 2005, Screening for deep-marine reservoirs in frontier basins: Part
 903 1—Examples from offshore mid-Norway: *Aapg Bulletin*, v. 89, p. 853-882.

904 Gervais, A., T. Mulder, B. Savoye, and E. Gonthier, 2006, Sediment distribution and evolution of
 905 sedimentary processes in a small sandy turbidite system (Golo system, Mediterranean Sea):
 906 implications for various geometries based on core framework: *Geo-Marine Letters*, v. 26, p. 373-395.

907 Grundvåg, S. A., E. P. Johannessen, W. Hell-Hansen, and P. Plink-Björklund, 2014, Depositional
 908 architecture and evolution of progradationally stacked lobe complexes in the Eocene Central Basin
 909 of Spitsbergen: *Sedimentology*, v. 61, p. 535-569.

910 Haldorsen H, H., Damsleth E. 1990. Stochastic modelling. *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, 42, 404-
 911 412.

912 Hanquiez, V., T. Mulder, S. Toucanne, P. Lecroart, C. Bonnel, E. Marchès, and E. Gonthier, 2010, The
 913 sandy channel-lobe depositional systems in the Gulf of Cadiz: Gravity processes forced by contour
 914 current processes: *Sedimentary Geology*, v. 229, p. 110-123.

915 Haughton, P., C. Davis, W. Mccaffrey, and S. Barker, 2009, Hybrid sediment gravity flow deposits –
 916 Classification, origin and significance: *Marine & Petroleum Geology*, v. 26, p. 1900–1918.

917 Hawie, N., Covault, J. A., Dunlap, D., and Sylvester, Z. 2018. Slope-fan depositional architecture from
 918 high-resolution forward stratigraphic models. *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 91, 576-585.

919 Hempton, M., Marshall, J., Sadler, S., Hogg, N., Charles, R. & Harvey, C. 2005. Turbidite reservoirs of
 920 the Sele Formation, Central North Sea: geological challenges for improving production. In: Parker, J.R.
 921 (ed.) *Petroleum Geology of Northwest Europe and Global Perspectives – Proceedings of the 6th*
 922 *Petroleum Geology Conference*. Geological Society, London, 449–459.

923 Hodgson, D. M., S. S. Flint, D. Hodgetts, N. J. Nkwater, E. P. Johannessen, and S. M. Luthi, 2006,
 924 Stratigraphic Evolution of Fine-Grained Submarine Fan Systems, Tanqua Depocenter, Karoo Basin,
 925 South Africa: *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, v. 76, p. 20-40.

926 Hofstra, M., A. Pontén, J. Peakall, S. Flint, K. Nair, and D. Hodgson, 2016, The impact of fine-scale
 927 reservoir geometries on streamline flow patterns in submarine lobe deposits using outcrop
 928 analogues from the Karoo Basin: *Petroleum Geoscience*, v. 23, 159 – 176.

929 Hovadik, J. M., and D. K. Larue, 2010, Stratigraphic and structural connectivity: Geological Society
 930 London Special Publications, v. 347, p. 219-242.

931 Islam M. S., and T. Manzocchi, 2017. The transmissibility of faulted connections in corner-point
 932 geometry models. *Petroleum Geoscience*, 23, 148-158.

933 Jegou, I., B. Savoye, C. Pirmez, and L. Droz, 2008, Channel-mouth lobe complex of the recent Amazon
 934 Fan: The missing piece: *Marine Geology*, v. 252, p. 62-77.

935 Johnson, S. D., S. Flint, D. Hinds, and H. De Ville Wickens, 2001, Anatomy, geometry and sequence
 936 stratigraphy of basin floor to slope turbidite systems, Tanqua Karoo, South Africa: *Sedimentology*, v.
 937 48, p. 987-1023.

938 Jones D. W., Large S., McQueen A., Helmi A. 2015. Reservoir geology of the Paleocene Forties
 939 Sandstone Member in the Fram discovery, UK Central North Sea. In: McKie, T., Rose, P. T. S., Hartley,
 940 A. J., Jones, D. W. & Armstrong, T. L. (eds) In: Tertiary Deep-Marine Reservoirs of the North Sea
 941 Region. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 403, 219-246.

942 Kane, I. A., W. D. McCaffrey, and O. J. Martinsen, 2009, Allogenic vs. Autogenic Controls on
 943 Megaflute Formation: *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, v. 79, p. 643-651.

944 Kilhams B., Hartley A., Huuse M., Davis C. 2012. characterizing the Paleocene turbidites of the North
 945 Sea: the Mey Sandstone Member, Lista Formation, UK central graben. *Petroleum Geoscience*, 18,
 946 337-354.

947 King M. J. 2007. Upgridding and Upscaling: Current Trends and Future Directions. SPE-112810-DL.
 948 SPE distinguished Lecturer Series, Society of Petroleum Engineers.

949 King, P. R. 1990. The conductivity and connectivity of overlapping sandbodies. In: Buller A. T., Berg,
 950 E., Hjelmeland, O., Kleppe, J., Torsaeter, O. & Aasen, J. O. (eds) North Sea Oil and Gas Reservoirs III.
 951 Graham and Trotman, London, 353–362.

952 Labourdette R., Crumeyrolle P., Remacha E. 2008. Characterisation of dynamic flow patterns in
 953 turbidite reservoirs using 3D outcrop analogues: Example of the Eocene Morillo turbidite system
 954 (south-central Pyrenees, Spain). *Marine and Petroleum Geology* 25 (2008) 255–270.

955 Larue, D. K., and J. Hovadik, 2006, Connectivity of channelized reservoirs: a modelling approach:
 956 *Petroleum Geoscience*, v. 12, p. 291-308.

957 Lyons, K. T., 1994, Relating depositional facies to seismic-scale stratal geometries, Upper Jurassic
 958 Great Vally Sequence, California: Submarine Fans and Turbidite Systems. *Sequence Stratigraphy,*
 959 *Reservoir Architecture and Production Characteristics, Gulf of Mexico and International. Gulf Coast*
 960 *Section, SEPM, 15th Annual Research Conference*, p. 221-232.

961 Macdonald, H. A., J. Peakall, P. B. Wignall, and J. Best, 2011, Sedimentation in deep-sea lobe-
 962 elements: implications for the origin of thickening-upward sequences: *Journal of the Geological*
 963 *Society*, v. 168, p. 319-332.

964 Manzocchi, T., Heath, A. E., Palananthakumar, B., Childs, C., Walsh, J. J. 2008. Faults in conventional
 965 flow simulation models: a consideration of representational assumptions and geological
 966 uncertainties. *Petroleum Geoscience* 14, 91-110.

967 Manzocchi, T., J. J. Walsh, P. Nell and G Yielding. 1999. Fault transmissibility multipliers for flow
 968 simulation models. *Petroleum Geoscience* 5, 53-63.

969 Manzocchi, T., J. J. Walsh, M. Tomasso, J. Strand, C. Childs, and P. D. W. Haughton. 2007. Static and
 970 dynamic connectivity in bed-scale models of faulted and unfaulted turbidites: *Geological Society,*
 971 *London, Special Publications*, v. 292, p. 309-336.

972 Marchand, A. M., G. Apps, W. Li, and J. R. Rotzien, 2015, Depositional processes and impact on
 973 reservoir quality in deepwater Paleogene reservoirs, US Gulf of Mexico: AAPG Bulletin, v. 99, p.
 974 1635-1648.

975 Milliman, J. D., and J. P. Syvitski, 1992, Geomorphic/tectonic control of sediment discharge to the
 976 ocean: the importance of small mountainous rivers: The Journal of Geology, p. 525-544.

977 Mulder, T., Y. Callec, O. Parize, P. Joseph, J.-L. Schneider, C. Robin, E. Dujoncuoy, T. Salles, J. Allard,
 978 and C. Bonnel, 2010, High-resolution analysis of submarine lobes deposits: Seismic-scale outcrops of
 979 the Lauzanier area (SE Alps, France): Sedimentary Geology, v. 229, p. 160-191.

980 Normark, W. R., C. K. Paull, D. W. Caress, W. Ussler III, and R. Sliter, 2009, Fine-scale relief related to
 981 Late Holocene channel shifting within the floor of the upper Redondo Fan, offshore Southern
 982 California: Sedimentology, v. 56, p. 1690-1704.

983 Oluboyo, A., R. Gawthorpe, K. Bakke, and F. Hadler-Jacobsen, 2014, Salt tectonic controls on deep-
 984 water turbidite depositional systems: Miocene, southwestern Lower Congo Basin, offshore Angola:
 985 Basin Research, v. 26, p. 597-620.

986 Pettinga, L., Jobe, Z., Shumaker L., and Howes N. 2018. Morphometric scaling relationships in
 987 submarine channel-lobe systems. Geology, 46, 819-822.

988 Pfeiffer, D. S., B. T. Mitchell, and G. Y. Yevi, 2000, Mensa, Mississippi Canyon Block 731 field, Gulf of
 989 Mexico—An integrated field study: Deep-water reservoirs of the world: Gulf Coast Section SEPM
 990 Foundation 20th Annual Research Conference, p. 756-775.

991 Prlat, A., J. A. Covault, D. M. Hodgson, A. Fildani, and S. S. Flint, 2010, Intrinsic controls on the range
 992 of volumes, morphologies, and dimensions of submarine lobes: Sedimentary Geology, v. 232, p. 66-
 993 76.

994 Prélat, A., D. Hodgson, and S. Flint, 2009, Evolution, architecture and hierarchy of distributary deep-
 995 water deposits: a high-resolution outcrop investigation from the Permian Karoo Basin, South Africa:
 996 *Sedimentology*, v. 56, p. 2132-2154.

997 Prélat, A., and D. Hodgson (2013). The full range of turbidite bed thickness patterns in submarine
 998 lobes: controls and implications. *Journal of the Geological Society* 170, 209-214.

999 Pringle, J. K., Brunt R. L., Hodgson D. M., Flint S. S. 2010. Capturing stratigraphic and
 1000 sedimentological complexity from submarine channel complex outcrops to digital 3D models, Karoo
 1001 Basin, South Africa. *Petroleum Geoscience*, 16, 307–330.

1002 Pyles, D. R., 2007, Architectural elements in a ponded submarine fan, Carboniferous Ross Sandstone,
 1003 western Ireland: Atlas of deep-water outcrops: AAPG Studies in Geology, v. 56, p. 206-209.

1004 Pyles, D. R., L. Strachan, and D. Jennette, 2014, Lateral juxtapositions of channel and lobe elements
 1005 in distributive submarine fans: Three-dimensional outcrop study of the Ross Sandstone and
 1006 geometric model: *Geosphere*, v. 10, p. 1104-1122.

1007 Pyrcz M. J., Catuneanu, O., and Deusch C. V. 2005. Stochastic surface-based modelling of turbidite
 1008 lobes. *AAPG Bulletin*, 89, 117-191.

1009 Pyrcz, M. J., Sech R. P., Covault J. A., Willis B. J., Sylvester Z., and Sun T. 2015. Stratigraphic rule-
 1010 based reservoir modelling. *Bulletin of Canadian Petroleum Geology*, 63, 287-303.

1011 Romans, B. W., S. M. Hubbard, and S. A. Graham, 2009, Stratigraphic evolution of an outcropping
 1012 continental slope system, Tres Pasos Formation at Cerro Divisadero, Chile: *Sedimentology*, v. 56, p.
 1013 737-764.

1014 Saller, A., K. Werner, F. Sugiaman, A. Cebastian, R. May, D. Glenn, and C. Barker, 2008,
 1015 Characteristics of Pleistocene deep-water fan lobes and their application to an upper Miocene
 1016 reservoir model, offshore East Kalimantan, Indonesia: *AAPG bulletin*, v. 92, p. 919-949.

- 1017 Santos, R. R. A., 2000, Adaptive visualization of deepwater turbidite systems in Campos Basin using
1018 3-D seismic: *Leading Edge*, v. 19.
- 1019 Satur, N., A. Hurst, B. Cronin, G. Kelling, and K. Gürbüz, 2000, Sand body geometry in a sand-rich,
1020 deep-water clastic system, Miocene Cingöz Formation of southern Turkey: *Marine and Petroleum*
1021 *Geology*, v. 17, p. 239-252.
- 1022 Savoye, B., N. Babonneau, B. Dennielou, and M. Bez, 2009, Geological overview of the Angola–Congo
1023 margin, the Congo deep-sea fan and its submarine valleys: *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies*
1024 *in Oceanography*, v. 56, p. 2169-2182.
- 1025 Sømme, T. O., W. Helland-Hansen, O. J. Martinsen, and J. B. Thurmond, 2009, Relationships between
1026 morphological and sedimentological parameters in source-to-sink systems: a basis for predicting
1027 semi-quantitative characteristics in subsurface systems: *Basin Research*, v. 21, p. 361-387.
- 1028 Stephen K. D., J. R. Clark and A. R. Gardiner, 2001. Outcrop-based stochastic modelling of turbidite
1029 amalgamation and its effects on hydrocarbon recovery. *Petroleum Geoscience* 7, 163-172.
- 1030 Steyn, R., 2009, Modelling the architecture of distal sand-rich lobe deposits: an example from Fan 2,
1031 Skoorsteenberge Formation, Tanqua Karoo, South Africa, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- 1032 Straub, K. M., and D. R. Pyles, 2012, Quantifying the hierarchical organization of compensation in
1033 submarine fans using surface statistics: *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, v. 82, p. 889-898.
- 1034 Sullivan, M. D., J. L. Foreman, D. Stern, and G. N. Jensen, 2004, An Integrated Approach to
1035 Characterization and Modeling of Deep-water Reservoirs, Diana Field, Western Gulf of Mexico:
1036 *Environmental Science & Technology*, v. 40, p. 4016-4024.
- 1037 Tahmasebi P. 2018. Multiple Point Statistics: A Review. In: Daya Sagar B. S. et al. (eds) *Handbook of*
1038 *Mathematical Geosciences*. 613-643.

1039 Weber, K., 1986, How heterogeneity affects oil recovery, *in* L.W. Lake and H.B. Carroll, Jr., eds.,
1040 Reservoir characterization, p. 487-544.

1041 Weislogel, A. L., S. A. Graham, and E. Z. Chang, 2007, Accumulation of the Middle to Upper Triassic
1042 Songpan-Ganzi turbidite complex, China, *in* T. H. Nilsen, R. D. Shew, G. S. Steffens, and J. R. J. Studlick,
1043 eds., Atlas of deep-water outcrops: AAPG Studies in Geology 56, CD-ROM, 20 p.

1044 Wu, X-H., Bi, L. and Kalla, S. 2012. Effective parameterization for reliable reservoir performance
1045 predictions. International Journal for Uncertainty Quantification, 2, 259-278.

1046 Zaragosi, S., G. Auffret, J.-C. Faugères, T. Garlan, C. Pujol, and E. Cortijo, 2000, Physiography and
1047 recent sediment distribution of the Celtic Deep-Sea Fan, Bay of Biscay: Marine Geology, v. 169, p.
1048 207-237.

1049 Zhang, L., 2015, Quantitative characterization and hierarchical modelling of deepwater lobe deposits:
1050 PhD thesis, University College Dublin.

1051

Table 1. Dimensional and stacking input for the four types of object in the example lobe model (Figure 14). Sizes for the lobe elements and channel elements are input as distances, while sizes of beds are input as a fraction of the relevant dimension of the element they are placed within. Unless stated otherwise, the range of values given represents the smallest and largest values of a uniform distribution.

	Lobe elements	Channel elements	Beds in Lobe elements	Beds in Channel elements
Width (m, or fraction)	2000 – 5000	400 – 600	0.6 - 0.9	0.8 - 0.95
Length (m, or fraction)	2500 – 7000	2000, 500*	0.7 - 0.95	0.42 - 0.48
Thickness (m, or fraction)	3 – 7	0 – 10**	0.1 - 0.4***	0.08 - 0.4
Volume Fraction	0.84	0.08	0.85	0.95
Amalgamation Ratio	0.2	0.05	0.4	0.5

*The two values given for the length of the channel elements refer to wavelength and amplitude respectively.

** Channels decrease in thickness from the maximum to the minimum value over their length.

*** A vertical thickening-up trend is used in accordance with observations from the Ross Formation (Madonald et al. 2011).

Figure Caption

Figure 1. (a) Amalgamation ratio versus net:gross ratios for 1D samples measured in the Mt. Messenger sandstone, Tongaporutu beach, New Zealand (Manzocchi et al. 2007) and the Tres Pasos formation, Cerro Divisadero, Chile (Romans et al. 2009). The two curves have compression factors of 0.05 and 0.14, representative of these two datasets. (b, c) Cross-sections at net:gross ratios of 0.5, 0.7 and 0.9, and amalgamation ratio values representative of the two datasets, generated using the compression-based object modelling approach, assuming constant sized sand beds.

Figure 2. (a) Schematic cartoon of the lobe hierarchy considered in this study (after Prlat et al. 2010). (b) Dip-correlation panel of lobe elements and lobes within two lobe complexes observed in outcrop in the Eocene Central Basin of Spitsbergen. Redrawn from Grundvg et al. (2014). (c) Outcrop photo of lobe elements in a lobe from the Ross Formation, Ross Bay, Ireland.

Figure 3. Diagram showing schematically how a logged section is analysed to quantify hierarchical stacking parameters. (a) The fine-grained units (ILC: Inter-lobe complex units. IL: Inter-lobe units. ILE: Inter-lobe element units. IB: Inter-bed units) and erosional amalgamation surfaces (BAS: Bed-scale amalgamation surface. LEAS Lobe element scale amalgamation surface) are interpreted within a hierarchical context. Stacking characteristics at individual hierarchical levels are calculated in each container as a function of the object, inter-object, and object-specific amalgamation surfaces ignoring hierarchically smaller features. The sequence is annotated for characterizing properties of lobe stacking in the lobe complex (b), Lobe element stacking in the lobes (c) and bed stacking in the lobe elements (d). See text for discussion.

Figure 4. Procedure for estimating the stacking data in highly amalgamated beds, using an example of a lobe element from the Ross Formation (a). The log (b) contains two discrete sand beds at the base which define the representative bed thickness assumed in the calculations. (c) Based on the thickness of the highly amalgamated bed, the amalgamation ratio and the average sandstone bed

thickness are calculated for a range of assumed numbers of amalgamation surfaces. The overall amalgamation ratio is given when the average sandstone bed thickness equals to the assumed representative bed thickness. See text for discussion.

Figure 5. Distributions of lengths (a), widths (b) and thickness (c) for beds (B), lobe elements (LE), lobes (L), lobe complexes (LC) and fans (F), compiled from the literature. The number of data in each distribution is reported (n). Note that bed data are only available for thickness. The Fan data (F) are included for comparison although these objects are of a larger hierarchical scale than the objects considered in this paper. The plots compile measurements from Abreu et al. (2010), Banonneau et al. (2002), Bernhardt et al. (2011), Bourget et al. (2010), Bruhn et al. (1998), Chapin et al. (2007), Deptuck et al. (2008), Drinkwater and Pickering. (2001), Dutton et al. (2003), Figueiredo et al. (2010), Fjellanger et al. (2005), Fonnesu et al. (2003), Gervais et al. (2006), Grundvåg et al. (2014), Hanquiez et al. (2010), Jegou et al. (2008), Johnson et al. (2001), Lyons et al. (1994), Milliman and Syvitski. (1992), Normark et al. (2009), Oluboyo et al. (2014), Pfeiffer et al. (2000), Prélat et al. (2009), Pyles (2007), Zaragosi et al. (2000), Saller et al. (2008), Santos et al. (2000), Satur et al. (2000), Sømme et al. (2009), Savoye et al. (2009), Weislogel et al. (2007), Zhang (2015).

Figure 6. Cross-plots of width vs. length (a) and thickness vs. width (b,c) for lobe elements, lobes and lobe complexes, compiled from the literature. Data in (a) and (b) are reported in or derived from figures published by Abreu et al. (2010), Banonneau et al. (2002), Bernhardt et al. (2011), Bruhn et al. (1998), Chapin et al. (2007), Deptuck et al. (2008), Drinkwater and Pickering (2001), Dutton et al. (2003), Figueiredo et al. (2010), Fjellanger et al. (2005), Fonnesu et al. (2003), Grundvåg et al. (2014), Gervais et al. (2006), Hanquiez et al. (2010), Jegou et al. (2008), Lyons et al. (1994), Milliman and Syvitski. (1992), Normark et al. (2009), Oluboyo et al. (2014), Pfeiffer et al. (2000), Prélat et al. (2009), Pyles (2007), Saller et al. (2008), Santos et al. (2000), Weislogel et al. (2007), Zhang (2015), Zaragosi et al. (2000). The multi-level data for the four systems in (c) are taken from Deptuck et al. (2008), Prélat et al. (2009), Saller et al. (2008) and Zhang (2015).

1115 Figure 7. Width-to-thickness ratios for the data shown in Figure 6a, sub-divided on the basis whether
1116 the measurements were made from outcrop observations or sub-surface imaging.

1117 Figure 8. Distribution of (a) volume fraction, (b) amalgamation ratio, (c) amalgamation ratio vs.
1118 volume fraction and (d) number of objects, for lobes in lobe complexes (L in LC), lobe elements in
1119 lobes (LE in L) and beds in lobe elements (B in LE). The data have been calculated from sections and
1120 logs published by Bernhardt et al. (2011), Drinkwater and Pickering (2001), Grundvåg et al. (2014),
1121 Hodgson et al. (2006), Mulder et al. (2010), Prélat et al. (2009), Pyles (2007), Pyles et al. (2014),
1122 Sullivan et al. (2004), Steyn (2009) and Zhang (2015).

1123 Figure 9. Characteristic dimensions and stacking patterns for (a) lobes in a lobe complex, or lobe
1124 elements in a lobe; and (b) beds in a lobe element. The facies descriptions contained in the figure
1125 are discussed in the text.

1126 Figure 10. The two steps in the compression-based object modelling workflow, for a sequence with a
1127 80% net:gross and 30% amalgamation ratio. The cross-sections on the left show sand objects (yellow)
1128 in a shale background (dark grey), while the sections on the right show an enlarged region with the
1129 model cell edges drawn in black. (a) In the first step, objects are placed randomly in a regular grid
1130 with a net:gross ratio equal to the target amalgamation ratio. (b) In the second step, sand cells are
1131 expanded and shale cells are compressed, resulting in a sequence with the target amalgamation and
1132 net:gross ratios. Equivalent beds (1 and 2) are shown in both steps.

1133 Figure 11. Cross-sectional illustration of the compression algorithm for two object types. The yellow
1134 objects are the same in each case, but the scaling factor used for the green objects increases from (a)
1135 through to (c), resulting in a greater degree of compensational stacking of these objects. The upper
1136 cross-sections shown the final models which have identical volume fractions to each other. Red lines
1137 show amalgamations. The lower cross-sections show the initial object-based models before
1138 application of the compression algorithm.

Figure 12. Cross-sectional illustration of the hierarchical compression-based object modelling method. (a) A compression-based model at a larger scale contains objects (Objects 1 and 2 used in the remainder of the figure are labelled) that form the boundaries of smaller-scale compression-based models. These are initially modelled in their ideal depositional geometry (b, c) before being transformed to fit the object in the larger-scale models (d, e). Red lines are amalgamation surfaces. No scale is given as the figure is not intended to represent realistic geological stacking.

Figure 13. Illustration of the various grids used in the modelling. (a) A two-level hierarchical model containing beds (yellow), inter-beds (grey) and inter-elements (black). (b) The grids used to represent the model area shown in (a). Green lines are the boundaries of the elements which are each represented with an individual grid in the bed-scale models. Only the preserved portions of incomplete grid cells above (representing onlaps) or below (representing erosional truncations) the element boundaries are drawn. (c) The large-scale element grid that provides the framework to which the small-scale grids (b) are referenced. The element boundaries (green lines) are identical on (b) and (c). (d) The single unified pillar grid output to the simulator. (e) and (f) show closeups of the area outlined in (a), for the hierarchical model (e) and the output simulation model (f). This region contains overlapping beds in contact with truncated beds across an erosional surface, a challenging geometry to honour in the flow model. Cells A to K are discussed in the text.

Figure 14. Illustration of the hierarchical compression-based object modelling method. (a) The final 3D model generated with the method, with the cross-sectional plane used in the remainder of the figure illustrated. (b) The deterministic subdivision of the model volume at the largest scale into lobe and inter-lobe units is user-defined. The highlighted lobe is used in the remainder of the figure. (c) Geometrical template for lobe elements. The locus of the element (indicated by the cross) must be contained within the model area. (d) Geometrical template for channel elements. The black region constrains the position at which channels enter the model. (e, f). Geometrical templates for beds in lobe elements and channel elements respectively. The bed locus must be contained within the

container element, indicated by the grey shading. Colours in (c – f) represent thickness in meters. (g) Lobe elements and channel elements are placed stochastically, according to user-defined dimensional and stacking data. Amalgamation surfaces are drawn where present. (h) Beds are placed stochastically in the lobe elements and channel elements, according to user-defined dimensional and stacking data. (i) A portion of the model showing the association in the model between more erosive channel elements and less erosive lobe elements. Bed-scale amalgamation surfaces are drawn where present. Maps showing volume fraction (j) and amalgamation ratio (k) of the elements in the lobe. Maps showing net:gross ratio (l) and amalgamation ratio (m) of beds in the lobe.

Figure 15. (a) Cross-sections through the full 3D model, showing the sand beds and the hierarchy of fine-grained units. The line of section is illustrated in Figure 14a. (b) Enlargement of the region shown in (a).

Figure 16. (a) Cross-section without vertical exaggeration of a portion of the full model, showing the sand beds and the various fine-grained units. (b) Outcrop photo at the same scale, from the Montagne de l'Avalanche outcrop of the Grès d'Annot lobe sequence (reproduced from Collins et al. 2015).

Figure 17. Flow simulation model created from the hierarchical model. All sands have identical properties, and the impermeable shale layers are not shown. (a) Model cells. (b) Water saturation following a water-flood from four injector wells located at the corners of the model (I), to a producer well at the centre of the model (P). (c) Sub-division of the model according to the local thickness of amalgamated sand beds. This measure provides a proxy for the three facies associations (amalgamated sands, heterolithic sands and thin-bedded fringe deposits) often used for these sequences. See text for discussion.

1187 Figure 18. Details of the results and structure of the flow simulation model (a-d) and hierarchical
1188 geomodel (e). (a) Water saturation and (b) cell pressure, for the full model at the end of the
1189 simulation period. The field of view is the same as the full model cross-section shown in Fig 14b. (c)
1190 Water saturation and (d) cell pressure, for the portion of the model highlighted in (b). The cell edges
1191 are drawn as black lines, and white areas are gaps in the simulation grid representing shales. (e)
1192 Section of the geological model for exactly the same region as (c) and (d).

Fig 1

Fig 2

Fig 3

Fig 4

Fig 5

Fig 6

Fig 7

Fig 8

Fig 9

Fig 10

Fig 11

(a) Model of large-scale objects

(b) Initial small-scale model for Object 1.

(c) Initial, pre-erosional small-scale model for Object 2.

(d) Object 1 fitted to large-scale model volume

(e) Object 2 fitted to large-scale model volume and eroded by the overlying large-scale object

Fig 12

Fig 13

Fig 14

Fig 15

Fig 16

Fig 17

Fig 18