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Abstract: Slugging flow in the offshore oil & gas production attracts lot of attention due to it’s limitation of production rate, periodic overload on processing facilities, and even direct cause of emergency shutdown. This work aims at two correlated objectives: (i) Preventing slugging flow; and meanwhile, (ii) maximizing the production rate at the riser of an offshore production platform, by manipulating a topside choke valve through a learning switching model-free PID controller. The results show good steady-state performance, though a long settling time due to the unknown reference for no slugging flow.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The oil and gas industry has spent a lot of time and effort in optimizing the production process. One area of interest is the reduction of severe slug in pipeline and riser systems. Some operating conditions lead to undesired flow regimes, since they cause varying flow rates and pressures in the system. Both the flow and pressures can either be constant or follow sinusoidal periodic cycles. When the flow and pressures are varying in cycles, the production rate will be significantly reduced with regards to the safety issues and sometimes the fluctuation may lead to system shut down. There exist several consequences of having these oscillations: liquid overflow and high pressure in the separators, overload on gas compressors, fatigue caused by repeating impact, high frictional pressure drop, low production, and production slop, (Hill and Wood (1994)). The slug flow is the flow pattern creating the biggest oscillations.

There are several different types of slugging flow, and riser-induced slug is a severe slug type. Fig. 1 illustrates the periodic slugging behavior of a vertical riser pipeline in 4 steps: (1) Liquid accumulates in the bottom of the riser. (2) When more gas and liquid enters the system, the pressure increases and the riser fills up with liquid. (3) After the blocked gas has built up, the pressure will be large enough to blow the liquid out of the riser. (4) After the blow-out, the liquid starts to build up in the bottom of the riser and the cycle repeats.

Being able to avoid the slug flow in the pipelines is of big economic interest. For this reason it is important to be able to predict the flow regime before the process causes problems. Traditionally flow maps are designed for each unique system from empirical data, see Hewitt and Roberts (1969) and Li et al. (2013). They indicate which flow pattern is represented in steady-state. It is noted that the flow maps are open-loop maps, with no control feedback loops being represented.

Some riser slug models have been proposed by Jahanshahi and Skogestad (2011), where a 4 state model has been developed, and Meglio et al. (2009), where a 3 state model has been developed. Earlier studies of a small-scale setup has been performed by Baardsen (2003). Some model-based control strategies of slugging is mentioned in Meglio et al. (2012). Furthermore Ogazi et al. (2010) and Isaac et al. (2011) have proven that control of the flow and slugging can increase production.
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Control techniques of eliminating the slugging has been studied by Meglioa et al. (2012), Jahanshahi et al. (2013), and Pagano et al. (2009). These studies concern nonlinear model-based methods and their comparison with simple PID controllers. This study will focus on a simple model-free controller, using an advanced learning algorithm.

The work described in this paper is based on a constructed lab setup developed in Biltoft et al. (2013), who also studied the re-creation of slug from experiments on this testing facility. The small-scaled testing facility is described in section 2. The rest of this paper will describe the development of controllers and the implementation at the lab facility, as well as analysis based on these results.

The rest of the paper is organized in the following order: In section 2 a review of the lab-sized setup developed by Biltoft et al. (2013) is described. Section 3 explains the development and implementation of two controllers: (i) Learning controller with unknown reference for production rate subject to no slugging flow in 3.1, and (ii) Controller with known reference in section 3.2. A conclusion and future work is described in section 4.

2. LAB TESTING FACILITY

Biltoft et al. (2013) studied the development of an economic lab-sized setup built at Aalborg University, Denmark. The main objective of this facility is to emulate different flow patterns often happening at the offshore oil and gas production platforms.

The construction consists of horizontal and vertical pipes which simulate a real pipeline/riser system. Water is transported through the pipeline and riser to the choke valve and lead to the separator and back to the water reservoir to close the loop. Air is injected at the start of the pipeline, transported through the system and let out after the choke valve. The angle of the horizontal pipe can be adjusted from 0° to 20°, and the placement of the air injection can be moved from start of the pipeline to the bottom of the riser to facilitate different scenarios (e.g. only riser).

A diagram of the setup can be seen in fig. 2. DPT is the difference pressure over the pump, PT1 is the riser bottom (lowpoint) pressure transmitter, PT2 is the topside pressure transmitter, PT3 is the separator pressure which here is the atmospheric pressure, F1 and F3 are the injection mass flow transmitters, and FT2 is the outflow mass flow measurement. The topside choke valve is a ball choke valve.

2.1 Running conditions

For this study a constant water and air flow of respectively 0.1 kg/s and 1.72 × 10^-4 kg/s is injected into the system. The topside choke valve is considered fully open at 60% because the separator is an open tank unable to pressurize, hence the choke valve will create the back pressure required.

Both the air and water injection values are defined by the designer to ensure a small mass velocity, thus riser-induced slug is easily created (Taitel (1986)).

![Fig. 2. Overview of the constructed lab-setup. Length of horizontal pipeline is 3.1 m, height of riser is 3 m, and length from riser to choke valve is 1.2 m. All pipe diameters are 6.3 cm (Biltoft et al. (2013))](image)

2.2 Bifurcation map

The slug could potentially be eliminated with the controlled choke valve, which, if controlled properly, would induce back pressure in the choke valve. Measuring the minimum and maximum low point pressure, for several different opening references will result in a map of the steady state performance of the system. This map is called the Bifurcation map. Hopf Bifurcation is defined as a dynamic system which loses it’s stability as a pair of complex conjugate eigenvalues of the linearized system cross the imaginary axis of the complex plane. From linear mathematical theory it can be noted as:

\[
Re(\lambda_{1,2}(J(x_0, u_0))) \geq 0 \text{ for } z > a_{bp} \\
Re(\lambda_{1,2}(J(x_0, u_0))) < 0 \text{ for } z \leq a_{bp}
\]

\[\lambda_{1,2}(J(x_0, u_0))\] are the eigenvalues of the Jacobian linearization, linearized around the states for two dominant conjugated poles, \(z\), and the inputs, \(u\). \(z\) is the choke valve opening and a subset of the inputs, and \(a_{bp}\) is the bifurcation point.

Figure 3 shows the pole-zero map using the Jacobian linearization of a nonlinear model by changing the choke valve opening, \(u\). The model is explained in detail in Biltoft et al. (2013). It is based on the three mass balance equations (3), (4), and (5), where \(\epsilon\) is the ratio of gas in the pipeline, and \(\omega\) is the mass flow. From the figure it is observed that there are three states, but the linearization shows that two conjugated poles are dominant in the system. These poles are crossing the imaginary axis as the choke valve opening increases, thus the Hopf Bifurcation is occurring.

\[
\dot{m}_{g,cb}(t) = (1 - \epsilon) \omega_{g, in}(t) - \omega_{g}(t) \\
\dot{m}_{g,r}(t) = \epsilon \cdot \omega_{g, in}(t) + \omega_{g}(t) - \omega_{g, out}(t) \\
\dot{m}_{l,r}(t) = \omega_{l, in}(t) - \omega_{l, out}(t)
\]

The bifurcation map for the running conditions has been carried out by Biltoft et al. (2013) and can be seen in fig. 4. It is observed that there are two bifurcation maps: One
Although the lowpoint pressure of the riser pipeline is not measured on offshore platforms, however a topside pressure transmitter is often available. This transmitter can be used to estimate the the lowpoint pressure (Helgesen (2010), Sivertsen and Skogestad (2005)).

Other mathematical detection methods have been studied (in Mokhatab (2010).)

Another way to determine the slug is by taking the difference pressure from top to bottom. The pressure difference is mainly caused by the weight of the liquid in the riser. When the flow is slugging the pressure difference will be smaller when the gas is accumulating at the bottom of the riser, and bigger in the blowout phase where the riser will be smaller when the gas is accumulating at the bottom of the riser, and bigger in the blowout phase where the riser is filled with gas. Equation (8) shows this relationship. Other mathematical detection methods have been studied in Mokhatab (2010).

\[
Top \, slug \, threshold > P_{top} - P_{bottom} > Low \, slug \, threshold
\]  

(8)

If slug occurs controller 1 is activated, and if slug does not occur controller 2 is activated.

(1) The objective of controller 1 is to eliminate the slug when slugging behavior is detected. The controller is slowly choking the valve using a PID controller until the elimination of the slug is carried out. At the elimination point, the lowpoint pressure is being saved, for a new reference when the controller is activated.
The implementation of the controller on the lab-sized setup can be observed in figure 7. The figure illustrates the lowpoint pressure of the riser. The controller is being activated after 200 seconds, to show the oscillation before the controller is added. At first the system is slugging which is being eliminated by choking the choke valve, then the choke valve is slowly opening until the slugging reoccurs. When the slugging reoccurs the first controller is activated again to eliminate the slug, and then the second controller knows the opening reference, thus the system stabilizes. Figure 8 shows the choke valve opening while the controller is enabled. Here it is observed that the controller learns maximum allowed opening reference and stabilizes the system.

It is observed that the pressure is varying when the slug is not occurring, this is caused by measurement noise. At this point it is hard to determine the controller’s performance, because the injections are constant. It is however observed that the controller successfully eliminates the slugging flow, and stabilizes the bottom pressure. Another test is carried out with the same controller, but where the water pump is given a constant voltage input to emulate the the pump’s constant effort. By measuring the outflow and applying this change, the performance can be determined by comparing the controller with the fully open choke valve (no controller applied). Figure 9 is showing the lowpoint pressure of the new test using the same controller, and figure 10 is showing the corresponding opening of the choke valve.

It is observed that the controller is stabilizing the pressure, as shown on the previous test. Observing the outflow transmitter (which is emulating the production rate) can...
evaluate the controller’s performance. The water mass outflow, measured in kg/s, is seen on figure 11.

The mass flow rate out of the separator is giving a production increase of 7.8% at steady state. Besides, this controller will work on any setup with any constant or slowly-varying running conditions, since the learning process will adjust to any running conditions. The transient response however is very slow; the settling time is approximately 2500 seconds. It is observed that one slug cycle is lasts 42 seconds on average, hence the settling time lasts 60 cycles. This is a great motivation to speed up the controller performance while keeping the good steady-state results.

The controller scheme will be as mentioned in section 3.1, however since no sliding window is needed to detect whether the slug flow occurs or not, the reaction of the controller is faster; hence the controller can be much more aggressive. The bottom pressure is still used as an output, and the choke valve opening as an input. Now the supervisory controller’s main purpose is to calculate the pressure changing rate rather than detect the slug. The new switching controller is designed the following way:

1. The system is slugging and the choke valve is closing fast to the elimination set-point, 35%, using an aggressive PID controller. There are some restrictions on how fast the choke valve can close, but compared to the settling time this restriction time is very small, thus not affecting the transient performance.

2. Now the slugging is eliminated and a new controller is being applied to open the choke valve to the highest opening, where slugging is not occurring, 39%. The choke valve is required to open in a slow manner, since the bifurcation map found is created by slowly changing the opening of the choke valve, and faster changes will recreate the slug. Hence the PID controller is not aggressive.

Figure 12 shows the opening percentage of the choke valve under influence of the controller where the references are already known.

3.2 Controller with known reference

Now it is assumed that the bifurcation map is known for the given running conditions, thus the controller does not need to be self-learning, because the reference point now is known. Figure 4 illustrates the bifurcation map of the lab scaled setup with the running conditions mentioned in section 2.1. This is the information which is being used for the new controller design.

The controller scheme will be as mentioned in section 3.1, however since no sliding window is needed to detect whether the slug flow occurs or not, the reaction of the controller is faster; hence the controller can be much more aggressive. The bottom pressure is still used as an output, and the choke valve opening as an input. Now the supervisory controller’s main purpose is to calculate the pressure changing rate rather than detect the slug. The new switching controller is designed the following way:

1. The system is slugging and the choke valve is closing fast to the elimination set-point, 35%, using an aggressive PID controller. There are some restrictions on how fast the choke valve can close, but compared to the settling time this restriction time is very small, thus not affecting the transient performance.

2. Now the slugging is eliminated and a new controller is being applied to open the choke valve to the highest opening, where slugging is not occurring, 39%. The choke valve is required to open in a slow manner, since the bifurcation map found is created by slowly changing the opening of the choke valve, and faster changes will recreate the slug. Hence the PID controller is not aggressive.

Figure 12 shows the opening percentage of the choke valve under influence of the controller where the references are already known.
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Fig. 13. The graph is showing the pressure at the bottom of the riser under influence of the controller where the references are already known. It is observed that initially one slug cycle occurs before the slug is being eliminated.

seconds. Hence the main objective of reducing the settling time is being achieved.

4. CONCLUSION

The study described in this paper has examined the tests obtained from a testing lab facility, the construction of a learning controller scheme, the implementation of the controller, and the evaluation of the controller’s performance from the implemented tests. The paper investigates intelligent manipulation of a topside choke valve, by the riser lowpoint pressure measurement. This measurement is not always available, but can be estimated, if a topside pressure transmitter is available.

The tests show bifurcation behavior which is being used as a key feature in the controller design. The controller is designed with a supervisory controller which is based on the slug determination. The implemented controller shows an 7.8 % production increase at steady-state, however the settling time is long. The learning controller is compared to a controller with no learning algorithm, but with the knowledge of which reference to aim for. This improves the transient performance by reducing the settling time from 2500 to 300 seconds but with the same steady-state production increase.

Because of these results it can be concluded that a proper learning controller of a topside choke valve can increase the production rate significantly in a small-scaled testing facility. With some pre-knowledge of the bifurcation points, it is further possible to reduce the settling time. The main advantage of the learning controller algorithm over existing choke valve controllers, is the ability of the controller to work on all pipeline-riser platforms with any dimensions and running conditions. However, before it is possible to guarantee the same performance on a real offshore platform, some simulation tests will be required to compare the experimental test results with the simulations of a real-sized platform.
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