

Finite Element Simulation of Rotary Steerable Drilling Systems Advance Understanding of Damaging Downhole Shock and Vibration

Nader E. Abedrabbo, and Liam A. Lines

Weatherford International
nader.abedrabbo@weatherford.com

Abstract: *The latest generation of rotary steerable drilling systems make it possible to reach hydrocarbons located deeper and in more hostile environments than ever before. These systems give the directional driller, standing some 10,000ft above on the rig floor, the ability to steer the well path in real-time to reach the elusive 'pay zone'. Rotary steerable drilling systems, which are located at the end of the drilling assemblies, are exposed to extreme conditions. In addition to temperatures in excess of 390°F and pressures up to 25,000 psi, they must also convey compressive and bending loads, torque and rotation to the drill bit from the surface, all while controlling the 3D trajectory of the wellbore.*

Shock and vibration sensors highlight the severity of the downhole environment, but the root cause of vibration is difficult to determine based on sensor data alone. Industry standard predictive analysis techniques are incapable of detecting the effects of contact dynamics and real-world testing has shown that these are among the most damaging to downhole drilling tools, significantly reducing efficiency of the drilling process. With some deepwater rig rates exceeding \$500,000 per day, the most successful systems are those that drill fastest with the lowest number of downhole failures.

Advanced finite element transient dynamic analysis and the manner in which it yields new insight into downhole shock and vibration shows that a combination of 1D beam elements and real 3D part geometries is critical to accurately predict the drilling assembly's dynamic signature, while still allowing for a timely solution process. This analysis enables the complex drilling assembly to be modelled within the confines of the wellbore. The analysis also assesses dynamics associated with rotating contact, such as lateral and torsional vibration, as well as the excitation of the drilling assembly's structural resonant modes. Transient dynamic analysis enables drilling assemblies and downhole tools to be designed from the outset to minimize contact dynamics and avoid excitation of damaging structural resonances. In addition to improved design of downhole tools, the results of this analysis also show the drilling team what drilling parameters are optimum to minimize and mitigate shock and vibration while drilling.

Keywords: *Vibration, Drilling Dynamics, Contact Dynamics, Rotary Steerable, Downhole Tools, Bottom Hole Assemblies, Oil & Gas.*

1. Introduction

Rotary Steerable Systems (RSS) have become an essential part of today's drilling marketplace. They build upon the advantages of conventional directional drilling systems through offering improved directional control, better well bore quality and the capability to drill extended reach wells - typically where the horizontal displacement to vertical depth ratio for the well exceeds 2:1. A conventional RSS assembly is connected directly to the drill bit and uses either a point or push the bit steering system to control the trajectory of the wellbore while continuously rotating. It is not uncommon for these assemblies to undergo high rotation speeds (in excess of 200 rpm) to maximize drilling rates and allow for proper hole cleaning. The particular RSS discussed in this paper comprises a drill bit with polycrystalline diamond compact (PDC) cutters, a fulcrum or pivot stabilizer which contacts the formation and a hydraulic non-rotating steering unit.

Drilling tools operate in some of the most hazardous environments known to man with pressures exceeding 25,000 psi and temperatures in excess of 390°F not to mention the corrosive and abrasive formations and fluids that they are exposed to. As a result, drilling assemblies are extremely expensive to develop and downhole damage can result in costly repair bills and non-productive time, especially on a deepwater off-shore well where rig rates approach \$500,000 per day.

There is always a fine balance between optimizing drilling parameters to avoid tool damage and drilling as fast as possible. These two usually cause conflict and understanding the limitations of the drilling system and the point at which it becomes in imminent danger of failure are critical. Typically, drilling companies rely on advanced sensors to determine the severity of the downhole environment and the likelihood of tool failure, however, a significant effort within the industry is seeing wider adoption of advanced modelling techniques to better understand what goes on downhole, enabling improved operating techniques and improved drilling assembly design.

Typically, downhole tool damage and poor drilling efficiency is a result of shock and vibration. Vibration reduces energy that would otherwise be used to shear and crush the rock. Unintended dynamic behavior of the drill-string can have costly consequences both in terms of reduced rate of penetration (ROP) and damage to drillstring components (Vandiver et al. 1990; Christoforou and Yigit 1997; Spanos et al. 2002; Zhu et al. 2011). This study focuses on the application of advanced modelling techniques to simulate and understand two lesser known vibration modes which are a source of significant problems downhole: rotational dynamics especially high frequency torsional oscillations (HFTO); and lateral shock and vibration where whirl (both forward and backward) is of particular interest. HFTO and whirl typically go unaddressed due to the requirement for advanced downhole sensors and modelling techniques outside of industry standard methods.

In this paper, an advanced finite element analysis model of two BHA systems was created in Abaqus. The two BHAs are identical except for the placement of an extra stabilizer at a critical position along the BHA. The effect of the extra stabilizer is shown to reduce the critical lateral displacements and accelerations of the BHA in general and for other critical tools along the BHA as well. Numerical results are compared to real experimental data for verification.

2. Conventional BHA Analysis

Drilling assemblies can range from simple to complex. A typical drilling assembly connects above the drill bit and consists of a steering tool to control wellbore trajectory, a navigation tool for obtaining inclination and azimuth, logging tools for determination of petrophysical and lithographical formation properties, a telemetry tool which sends downhole data to surface by electromagnetic and /or mud pulse telemetry, and drill collars / heavy weight drill pipe used for transition to the drill pipe above. BHAs can range from 10's to 100's of feet long and there is an endless variety of BHA configurations depending on application.

Performing computer based BHA analysis is a vital part of any drilling campaign. It can be used to detect damaging downhole conditions, both dynamic and static, that may occur during the drilling process and gives insight into optimum stabilizer placement. Modelling can also be used as a tool to analyze past failures and diversions from planned well trajectories. In both cases, computer modelling offers a more cost effective alternative to performing experimental tests for each BHA configuration.

Standard analysis methods developed for BHA analysis utilize a mixture of rigid-flexible multibody mechanical systems using the component mode synthesis method (Pogorelov et al., 2012).

BHA analysis has two main purposes:

1. Static Analysis: BHAs typically pass through highly curved sections of the well. These impart cyclic bending moments in the BHA which could result in gross overload or fatigue damage to downhole tools and the threaded connections between them. Static BHA analysis calculates the equilibrium state of the BHA due to the effects of gravity, hole curvature and axial compressive loads or weight on bit (WOB). Important results for this type of analysis include: The shape of the deformed BHA, location of contact points between the BHA and the wellbore and stress and bending moment distributions throughout the BHA. The BHA and well plan can then be optimized quickly and efficiently to minimize the chance of downhole tool damage. Figure 1 shows example results of static analysis. The plot shows the deformed BHA cross section, contact forces, bending moments and the von Mises stresses along the BHA length, respectively.




Figure 1. BHA Static Analysis Results.

2. **Vibration Analysis:** Industry standard analysis techniques such as linear vibration and forced frequency response enable resonant modes to be determined and critical operating parameters to be approximated. Linear vibration analysis of the BHA is performed using kinematic and forced harmonic excitations. Vibration sources, such as the cutting processes of the drill bit, contact point interaction with wellbore wall, rotation of eccentric parts and operation of BHA components (mud motors, RSS assemblies, etc.) are accounted for. The implemented analysis procedure, which is based on linearization of the equations of motion, is widely used and with relatively low computational expense. Figure 2 shows simulation results of the maximum lateral displacements as extracted from frequency domain vibration analysis of a sample BHA. Utilizing the forced frequency responses, the developed model has the ability to detect dangerous rotation speeds in the BHA which can cause damaging downhole vibrations through excitation of critical structural resonances.




Figure 2. Results of Linear Vibration Analysis.

In the past, historical and empirical data was heavily relied on to determine BHA suitability. Nowadays even the most fundamental analysis methods as previously described have proved invaluable and have been a major step in the right direction; however, there are some significant limitations. Typically, these limitations are overcome by over stabilizing the assembly, which is a common practice in rotor-dynamic problems. In the imperfect world of oil exploration, stabilization - specifically the number of stabilizers and their clearance with the drilled borehole - is under close scrutiny by drilling companies. Higher levels of stabilization are commonly considered to increase the chance of getting stuck in hole when drilling mobile or swelling formations. In addition, stabilizers can restrict the flow of rock cuttings and cause pressure spikes, which can damage formations and downhole tools. Stabilizers may also increase torque and drag putting higher loads on surface power systems and reducing the depth or lateral extension of the well. Particular focus recently has turned to efficient and effective stabilization rather than maximum stabilization and in order to evaluate this, more advanced time domain based simulation techniques are required.

3. Motivation for Time Domain Analysis

The main advantage of frequency domain vibration analysis is the fast solution time in which the analysis can be performed. Each analysis case can be completed within minutes. The fast solution time is particularly useful as linear vibration analysis typically requires the response behavior to be modelled at multiple WOBs and RPMs for a number of locations in the well.

Aside from the relatively fast solution time, linear vibration has some notable limitations:

- Frequency domain analysis is performed using linearized (simplified) equations of motion, therefore, time varying or transient effects, such as those resulting from contact, are not possible to determine from frequency domain vibration analysis.
- Due to the analysis methods used (frequency domain), time varying contact with the wellbore boundary is not possible. Therefore contact regions have to be manually imposed and are fixed during linear vibration analysis.
- Limited outputs are available: lateral, axial and torsional displacements only.
- No acceleration data is available.
- The analysis is sensitive to the location and amplitude of excitations applied to the BHA. It is extremely difficult to determine what the true input excitations should be, especially when multiple contact points exist and limited sensor data is available.

In contrast to frequency domain techniques, time domain analysis allows contact between the BHA and borehole to occur “naturally”. These may change during the course of the analysis. The advantages of time domain analysis are:

- The model is analyzed using nonlinear equations of motion, accounting for real physics.

- Forces occur naturally due to contact with the wellbore rather than relying on manual definition by user.
- A large set of output data, e.g. displacements, accelerations (lateral, torsional and axial) are available.
- Special contact formulations can be applied to account for drill bits & stabilizers (bit-rock interaction).
- Results can be easily correlated to real world sensor data – vibration severity is generated in terms of acceleration which is directly measured by downhole sensors.
- Interpretation of results can highlight the presence of contact dynamics such as backward whirl and the interaction/coupling between dynamic modes.
- Time domain analysis is based on real-physics and therefore is far more representative of the downhole environment.

There are, however, some notable drawbacks:

- The solution time can be considerably higher than frequency domain analysis (hours compared to minutes).
- It requires the user to have a special skill set, but in some circumstances the process can be semi-automated.
- It is not suitable for wide distribution; only used in special cases when time allows for extra solution time.

4. FEA Time Domain Analysis of BHA Systems

Time domain analysis was conducted on two BHAs. Both consisted of an 8.5 inch diameter PDC drill bit, point-the-bit RSS, integrated directional sonde (IDS), multi-frequency resistivity (MFR) tool, and drill collars. The only difference between the two BHAs is the addition of a stabilizer to the top end of the MFR (Figure 3). By analyzing these two systems using the time domain finite element analysis a better understanding of the effects of stabilization can be achieved on the overall stability of the test BHA.




Figure 3. Test BHAs: (a) Case 01: Non-Stabilized MFR Model; (b) Case 02: Stabilized MFR Model.

There are several challenges in efficiently applying the finite element analysis to the BHAs described in Figure 3. The ratio of the model's length to the typical diameter is in the order of 10^5 , which prohibits using shell and solid elements. Finite element analysis using Abaqus provides several tools for modelling the components of the BHA. The conference paper by Abedrabbo et al. (2012) provides details of the methods and requirements for modelling BHA systems. There are several options for creating the components of the BHA model:

4.1 Beam Only FEA Models:

In this method, all the BHA components are modeled using simplified beam elements (beam in space). Beam elements provide a good approximation to the geometry and stress distribution, resulting in an acceptable combination of accuracy and solution time. However, beam elements are most suited to static BHA analysis (no rotation applied) and frequency domain analysis. Due to the fact that beam elements are represented by a line in space where the cross section is a homogeneous circular section, they are not capable of capturing the complex contact dynamics that occur with the wellbore during rotation. This is particularly important for BHA parts with non-uniform geometry such as stabilizers. Figure 6a is the actual geometry of the stabilizer as created in a CAD program while Figure 6b is the graphical representation of the beam elements with the beam profile artificially rendered. As seen, the stabilizer representation using beam elements does not capture the complex contact geometry of the real part, and hence, the time domain response would not be realistic.




Figure 6. a) Actual pivot stabilizer geometry; (b) Beam element representation.

Figure 7 shows the lateral displacement of the beam-only model at the center of the RSS shaft which is a critical design point (Figure 5). The analysis does not exhibit the expected oscillations due to the rotation of BHA with time. After an initial lateral displacement due to application of gravity on the model, the beam rests on the bottom of the wellbore and rotates without generating any excitations. Although tangential friction is included, the model is unable to replicate the complex contact imposed by the blades of the stabilizers due to the smooth representation of the beam surface.




Figure 7. Lateral displacement results for beam elements at center of RSS shaft using time domain method.

4.2 Solid or Shell Element Models:

In order to be able to capture the true effects of the stabilizer blades as they make contact with the wellbore, the components of the BHA must use solid or shell elements. These element types, with

careful application, can capture the real contours of the part. However, although using full 3D solid or shell elements would provide the highest quality of results for the model, the fact that the BHA is very long compared to the required element sizes, the degrees of freedom of the model (total number of nodes and elements) would be substantial. This would render the solution time and computational resources unfeasibly high.

4.3 Mixed Beam-Solid Models:

An optimized strategy to perform time domain finite element analysis is to adopt a mixture of beam and solid (or shell) elements. Beam elements can be used for uniform parts of the BHA, e.g. drill pipes and drill collars, without any loss of reliability. Parts that have more complex non-uniform geometry, e.g. stabilizers, can be created using solid or shell elements. Kinematic coupling is then used to connect the different types of elements so that motion and excitations are transferred correctly. This method provides the best compromise, important contact information is captured by the real part geometry and analysis time is improved by using beam elements wherever possible.

Figure 9 shows the BHA model with the locations where 3D geometry was used to represent modelled parts. The other parts in the model were represented with beam elements.




Figure 9. BHA model with location of 3D geometry parts.

5. FEA Model Specifics

The following are details of the finite element model used in the time domain analysis:

- The 3D parts with complex geometry were modeled as discrete rigid bodies with a mixture of triangular and quadrilateral elements. The rigid element assumption is adequate for this analysis as plastic deformation is not anticipated in the simulation.
- Uniform pipe parts were modeled using Timoshenko beam (shear flexible) elements.
- The wellbore was modeled as an elastic body with properties of mild steel. This provided some degree of energy absorption (damping) to the model. A wellbore that is 0.5 in larger than the drill bit and stabilizers was used in the analysis which is considered a worst-case scenario for clearance between BHA and the wellbore.
- The model consists of 234,761 nodes (1,408,566 DOF) and 237,141 elements.
- The BHA was modeled in two orientations:
 - Horizontal where gravity acts perpendicular to BHA length; and
 - Near vertical with 1.0° inclination.
- RPM was applied at the top of BHA where it was ramped quickly to the desired value (shown in Figure 11).
- An exponential decay friction model (Static-Kinetic with Exponential Decay) was used.
- Boundary conditions applied were as follows:
 - Axial movement of the bit was restricted.
 - All other nodes were free.
 - An elastic bushing was applied at the top of the model to simulate the stiffness of the drill pipe to surface.
- The dynamic explicit analysis method with double precision was used (minimal mass scaling used).
- Utilizing a server machine with 24 CPUS, the model solution time ranged between 12-14 hours (depending on model).
- Output frequency for simulation animations was 100Hz.
- Output for the required nodes of interest was recorded at 1000HZ. In this paper, results are shown only from 0 to 250Hz frequency as this is the effective bandwidth of the dynamics sensor (Lines et al., 2014).

6. Time Domain Analysis Results

6.1 Horizontal Orientation

Figure 5 shows the lateral vibrations (y-axis) for both analyzed models (MFR with and without stabilizer) as recorded at the center of the RSS shaft. Figure 6 shows the results obtained for both models at the end of the MFR unit. In horizontal orientation gravity is applied along the Y-axis. As seen from the two figures, initially, gravity acts to pull the BHA to be in contact with the wellbore. However, as contact between the non-uniform geometries and the wellbore progresses, the RSS shaft begins to oscillate. Although this oscillation cannot be completely eliminated, it is beneficial if it is reduced as much as possible to minimize the workload on the RSS steering unit and to improve directionality stability. In the model without the added MFR stabilizer it can be observed that the RSS shaft exhibits larger amplitude oscillations. Although the stabilized MFR

was located more than 45 ft above the RSS unit, the effect on the overall stability of the system is apparent.




Figure 5. Lateral vibrations (y-axis) for horizontal BHA case at middle of RSS point.




Figure 6. Lateral vibrations for horizontal BHA case at end of MFR unit. The larger lateral displacement of the MFR without stab case is due to MFR sagging as a result of gravity.

Figure 7 shows the angular accelerations (torsional vibration) at the center of the RSS shaft. Figure 8 shows the FFT (PSD) of the torsional accelerations as show in Figure 7. From the FFT

plot, we notice that the dominant frequency is at 59.5 Hz, which corresponds well with observed field data for similar BHA as shown in Lines et al. (2013) (see Figure 12).




Figure 7. Angular accelerations at center of RSS shaft.




Figure 8. FFT of angular accelerations at center of RSS shaft.

6.2 Near Vertical Orientation:

In the near vertical orientation, the damping effect provided by gravity on the MFR is no longer present. Initially the MFR oscillates at small amplitudes within the wellbore. As momentum and

energy levels increase, the MFR enters a resonant frequency and quickly transitions into a destructive vibration mode. Figure 9 shows the results at the middle of the RSS shaft while Figure 10 is a comparison of the lateral vibrations near the end of the MFR. The figures show the extreme lateral vibration resulting from the un-stabilized MFR and how, in contrast, the addition of a single stabilizer significantly reduces vibration amplitude.




Figure 9: Lateral vibrations at middle of the RSS shaft for vertical orientation.




Figure 10: Lateral vibrations at end of MFR unit for vertical orientation.

6.3 Whirl Detection:

One of the main objectives from time domain analysis is to investigate if finite element models are capable of detecting whirl, both forward and backward. Our area of interest for whirl detection and elimination is at the RSS stabilizer (as shown in Figure 3) but the technique is equally applicable to all rotating elements which contact the stationary borehole. By extracting the lateral displacements for the RSS pivot stabilizer and plotting them versus time, the presence of whirl can be clearly observed.

Figure 11 shows the plot of backward whirl initiation for case #1 (without MFR stabilizer) and the full history for case #2 (with MFR stabilizer). Both the applied RPM rotation and the nodal history rotational direction for backward whirl are indicated. From the plot several things are noticed:

- Backward whirl is clearly visible in the analysis for Case #1 (MFR without stabilizer) as indicated both by the circular pattern of the nodal history and also by the fact that the nodal rotational history is opposite that of the applied RPM.
- Adding a stabilizer to the top MFR (Case #2) has been effective at eliminating the dangerous backward whirl. The stabilizer rolls benignly at the bottom of the borehole.




Figure 11: Lateral displacement history at center of RSS pivot stabilizer for Case #1 and full nodal history for Case #2.

7. Experimental Results

Weatherford has several reliable downhole vibration sensors capable of detecting several modes of downhole vibration and transmitting pertinent data to the surface in real-time (Lines et al. 2014). During a drilling study with a BHA similar to the one discussed here, the downhole dynamics

sensor detected HFTO. Figure 12 shows a rapid sample captured at the initiation of HFTO while drilling with an 8.5-in bit through a formation of chalk and marl (both carbonates). Note the presence of a strong 60 Hz frequency content in tangential accelerometer. This data correlates well with the 59.5 Hz torsional vibration frequency predicted by the analysis as shown previously (Figure 8).




Figure 12: Rapid sample data showing HFTO.

8. Conclusion

Abaqus nonlinear finite element analysis capabilities provided a very powerful tool in predicting the dynamic behavior of downhole drilling tools. The ability to integrate real 3D parts in the analysis enables the simulation of real physics, especially those relating to contact dynamics. Time domain analysis of the BHA, although computationally expensive compared to industry standard techniques, offers valuable insights that linearized frequency-domain vibration analysis is incapable of. Clear indication of lateral vibration, damaging whirling modes and HFTO at areas of interest can be predicted before drilling an actual well. It was also shown that the numerical predictions matched experimental results for the same system. Future improvements on the modelling methods developed and presented here include adding rock removal due to contact (hole enlargement), adding fluid-structure interaction (FSI) to gauge the damping effects of fluid and modelling of nonsymmetrical parts. Also, analysis automation is a priority in order for wider user participation.

9. References

1. Abedrabbo, N., Ring, L. and Gandikota, "Automation of Static and Dynamic FEA Analysis of Bottomhole Assemblies", in 2012 SIMULIA Customer Conference, Rhode Island, USA.
2. Christoforou, A.P. and Yigit, A.S. "Dynamic Modelling of Rotating Drill Strings with Borehole Interactions". *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, 206 (2): 243-260, 1997.
3. Lines, L. A., Stroud, D. R. H., Coveney, V. "Torsional Resonance - An Understanding Based on Field and Laboratory Tests with Latest Generation Point-the-Bit Rotary Steerable System". Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2013. doi:10.2118/163428-MS.
4. Lines, L. A., Mauldin, C. L., Hill, J. W., & Aiello, R. A. "Advanced Drilling Dynamics Sensor Allows Real-Time Drilling Optimization, Damage Prevention and Condition

- Monitoring of RSS and LWD BHAs”. Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2014. doi:10.2118/170586-MS.
5. Pogorelov, D., Mikheev, G., Lysikov, N., Rin, L., Gandikota, R., and Abedrabbo, N. “A Multibody System Approach to Drill String Dynamics Modeling”. Proceedings of the ASME 2012 11th Biennial Conference on Engineering Systems Design and Analysis, ESDA2012, Nantes, France.
 6. Spanos, P.D., Payne, M.L., and Secora, C.K. “Bottom-hole Assembly Modeling and Dynamic Response Determination”. Journal of Energy Resources Technology, 119 (3): 153-158, 1997. doi: 10.1115/1.2794983.
 7. Vandiver, K.J., Nicholson, J.W., and Shyu, R.-J. “Case Studies of the Bending Vibration and Whirling Motion of Drill Collars”. SPE Drill Eng. 5(4): 282-290. SPE-18652-PA, 1990. doi: 10.2118/18652-PA.
 8. Zhu, W., & Di, Q. “Effect of Prebent Deflection on Lateral Vibration of Stabilized Drill Collars”. Society of Petroleum Engineers, 2011. doi:10.2118/120455-PA.