

CO₂ storage and evaluation of important parameters affecting the CO₂ plume distribution: simulation and sensitivity analysis

Mohammad Rakibul Hasan Chowdhury and Soheila Taghavi

Department of Process, Energy and Environmental Technology, University of South-Eastern Norway, Norway.

E-mail corresponding author: soheila.t.hosnaroudi@usn.no

Abstract: Carbon capture utilization and storage (CCUS) offers a potential solution to mitigate the effects of anthropogenic CO₂ and to reduce the direct CO₂ emissions from stationary sources into the atmosphere. The captured CO₂ is injected into deep saline-water saturated formations or in depleted oil and gas fields, or into the oil fields for storage and/or enhanced oil recovery (EOR). The primary objective of this study is to identify and analyze the critical parameters affecting CO₂ plume development in the reservoir. Understanding the subsurface dynamics of carbon sequestration will facilitate to plan the subsurface process better. The simulation models are developed using the commercial software Computer Modelling Group, CMG. The plume dynamics that include plume volume and plume geometry over 30 years of injection and 170 years of post-injection period is investigated. Additionally, the contribution of different trapping mechanisms over the time horizon in the storage process is assessed. Moreover, a sensitivity analysis is done for evaluating the impact of variables including porosity, permeability, injection rate, and injector bottom hole pressure. The simulation results show that CO₂ plume propagates at an increased rate during the injection period and continues to disperse at a comparatively reduced rate after the injection ends. The horizontal spread of plume is significantly greater than the vertical propagation when the horizontal permeability is larger than the vertical. Additionally, the plume volume shows a linear relationship with the injected CO₂ amount. In terms of storage efficiency, the most prevalent CO₂ is free phase super critical CO₂ that contributes around 80% of the stored CO₂ whereas the rest are structurally or residually trapped and dissolved CO₂. From the sensitivity analysis in a homogenous reservoir, it can be concluded that the horizontal permeability is impacting the most (42%) for structural and residual trapping of CO₂ whereas porosity impacts the most (38%) for dissolution of CO₂ contributing to solubility trapping mechanism.

Keywords: CCUS, Plume dynamics, CO₂ Storage, CO₂ trapping mechanism, Sensitivity

1. INTRODUCTION

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) reduction from the atmosphere has become a global attention from last decade which resulted in imposing several laws against emitting CO₂ in the atmosphere. However, CO₂ production is inevitable in lot of processes which compelled the industries and researchers to draw more attention in capturing the produced CO₂ and storing them to a safe place. In the storage purpose, depleted oil reservoirs or aquifers has a good potential to be used for storage of CO₂. According to a study, there is approximately 139 giga tones of CO₂ storage potential in worldwide oil reservoirs (Godec et al., 2011). Geological sequestration of CO₂ is presently the most viable, and probably the sole, short-to-medium term strategy for substantially increasing CO₂ sinks and thereby decreasing overall carbon emissions into the atmosphere (Bachu, 2008). So, CO₂ storage in oil reservoirs, coupled with enhanced oil recovery (EOR), has gained attention as a strategy for both mitigating climate change and improving oil recovery. Currently, CO₂ storage in geological formations such as oil and gas reservoirs and deep saline aquifers is not a new technology. The extensive history of natural gas storage in North America and Europe and CO₂-EOR practices primarily in the U.S (Moritis, 2006) provide some evidences of this fact.

Additionally, numerous commercial-scale projects worldwide engage in CO₂ injection for various purposes, ultimately contributing to the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions, such as, in Canada, the Weyburn CO₂-EOR project uses CO₂ obtained from coal gasification (Whittaker et al., 2004). In the North Sea, the Sleipner project injects CO₂ stripped from natural gas into the Utsira formation (Torp and Gale, 2003). Over in Algeria, the In Salah project pumps CO₂ back into an aquifer underneath the gas field it came from (Riddiford et al., 2003) and some examples in Western Canada, show that CO₂ storage is often implemented for economic or regulatory reasons, not just for addressing climate change (Bachu, 2008) but resulted in the mitigation of diverse impact on climate change.

However, the success of CO₂ storage is highly dependent on the behavior of the CO₂ plume within the reservoir, which is influenced by reservoir characteristics (Birkholzer et al., 2015). The study by Luo et. al. (2022) suggests that studies on structural sequestration should take into account all relevant factors, and that the capacity of structural sequestration should be assessed in light of the characteristics of the caprock, the rate of CO₂ injection, and the saline aquifer actual geological

conditions. Current research in the field of CO₂ plume evolution and the impact of reservoir parameters on storage efficiency emphasizes the complexity and variability of geological storage environments. Al-Khdheawi et al. (2018) discusses the effects of heterogeneity, reservoir temperature, and wettability on CO₂ migration and trapping mechanisms. Myshakin et al. (2023) explores the impact of reservoir heterogeneity on fluid displacement and volumetric efficiency. But these studies underscore the critical role of physical reservoir characteristics in determining CO₂ storage efficiency. Moreover, Zapata et al. (2020) and Luo et al. (2022) contribute to this topic by investigating CO₂ plume dynamics over long-term injection periods and the effects of key parameters on gas recovery and storage efficiency, respectively. However, there remains a significant gap in comprehensive analyses integrating multiple reservoir parameters under varied operational conditions, particularly understanding the simultaneous effects of the reservoir parameters and dynamic injection scenarios on CO₂ storage efficiency.

The primary objective of this work is to observe plume evolution and analyze the reservoir parameters affecting CO₂ plume, and storage efficiency in the reservoir. These parameters include, reservoir permeability, porosity, pressure and temperature conditions, and fluid properties as well as the injection rate and injection bottom hole pressure. CO₂ storage model is developed in the commercial software Computer Modelling Group, CMG to investigate the CO₂ migration after a 30-year injection period and 170-year post-injection period. Sensitivity analysis is done among corresponding variables to understand the impact of different parameters on storage capacity. The simulation models are developed using CMG, by utilizing its five modules.

2. CO₂ STORAGE IN GEOLOGICAL MEDIA

Under normal atmospheric conditions, CO₂ exists as gas. However, when subjected to pressures exceeding 7.39 Mpa and temperatures above 31.1°C, reaching what is termed its critical point, it transitions into a supercritical fluid state (Zhi et al., 2019). In this form, CO₂ exhibits properties of both gases and liquids, making it ideal for underground storage. It becomes as dense as a liquid, which allows it to hold more CO₂ in the pore spaces of rock formations. At the same time, it maintains a gas-like viscosity, facilitating its movement through the rock layers. Reservoirs suitable for CO₂ storage are typically found deeper than 1 km, have a thickness of around 10500 m, and may extend for hundreds of kilometers across (Szulczewski, 2013). At these depths, CO₂ is kept in its supercritical condition, where it is somewhat lighter (~700 kg/m³) than the brine, oil, or any other existing fluids, leading it to migrate upwards due to buoyant forces (Verma et al., 2021). The upward movement of CO₂ ceases when it meets the caprock, effectively sealing it within the subsurface.

CO₂ has an influence on the relative permeability curve. CO₂ injection influences the wettability of the reservoir, causing the rock to become somewhat more water-wet, which promotes better oil displacement efficiency and optimizes the reservoir capacity to trap CO₂ effectively (Kułynycz, 2015). This process alters the endpoint relative permeabilities as well as

modifying the shape of the corresponding relative permeability curves (Taghavi et al., 2023).

This indicates that CO₂ injection reduces the mobility ratio, M , between oil and water. Mobility, λ , is characterized as the ratio of the endpoint relative permeability, K_r , to dynamic viscosity, μ .

$$\lambda = \frac{K_r}{\mu} \quad (1)$$

As defined by Ahmed (2010), the mobility ratio is the ratio of the mobility of the fluid causing displacement, such as λ_w to the mobility of the fluid being displaced, such as λ_o where the subscripts denote the water for w and oil for o.

$$M = \frac{\lambda_w}{\lambda_o} = \frac{k_{rw}}{k_{ro}} \cdot \frac{\mu_o}{\mu_w} \quad (2)$$

Enhancing the water-wetness of the rock decreases the residual oil saturation while increasing the irreducible water saturation (Taghavi et al., 2023). Consequently, the oil relative permeability is increased. Moreover, there is a decrease in oil viscosity, collectively leading to a lower mobility ratio (Aakre et al., 2018).

2.1 Geological media

Potential CO₂ storage options include deep saline aquifers, operational or depleted oil and gas fields, unmineable deep coal beds, and mined salt caverns. According to Saeedi (2012), deep saline aquifers have the advantage of extensive capacity and wide availability but face the disadvantage of unproven storage reliability. Active or depleted oil and gas reservoirs offer demonstrated storage security, established infrastructure, and enhanced hydrocarbon recovery, yet they are not available in all regions and may not be available for immediate use (Saeedi, 2012). Unminable coal seams can potentially enhance methane recovery but are limited by uncertain storage capacity and regional availability. Basalt formations provide a permanent trapping mechanism for CO₂, although they are constrained by slow reaction rates and limited field experiences (Saeedi, 2012). CO₂ is stored safely without risking the contamination of underground resources. Historically, they have effectively contained oil and gas under high pressure and temperature, thereby reducing the likelihood of CO₂ leakage over extended periods. Furthermore, these abandoned hydrocarbon storage sites can maintain the necessary temperature and pressure for CO₂ to reach supercritical condition (Van Der Meer, 2005).

2.2 CO₂ Trapping Mechanism

At least six mechanisms exist that can secure CO₂ within a storage complex over extended duration. Among the most recognized are structural trapping, capillary trapping, solubility trapping, and mineral trapping. Table 1 presents a comparative analysis of the trapping mechanisms.

Table 1. Comparison of different trapping mechanism (Ketzer et al., 2012; Raza et al., 2015)

Trapping Mechanism	Description	Advantages	Considerations
Structural and Stratigraphic Trapping	CO ₂ is trapped beneath an impermeable cap rock, similar to how oil and gas are trapped in petroleum fields.	-Direct and immediate trapping - Utilizes existing geological structures	- Dependent on the integrity of the cap rock - Limited by the structure's capacity and closure.
Capillary Trapping	CO ₂ becomes immobilized as a residual phase within the pore spaces of the storage medium.	- Rapid and efficient entrapment of CO ₂ - Enhanced storage security through immobilization. - Higher capillary force than buoyant force, leading to pore-scale CO ₂ bubbles	- Efficiency varies with rock properties and fluid characteristics - Requires sophisticated understanding of pore space interactions
Solubility Trapping	CO ₂ dissolves in brine, and the denser CO ₂ -saturated brine sinks within the storage medium.	- Contributes to long-term storage stability - Reduces risk of leakage by dissolving CO ₂	- Dependent on diffusion rates and storage medium properties - Slower process compared to capillary trapping
Mineral Trapping	Dissolved CO ₂ reacts with minerals in the storage medium to form stable carbonate minerals.	- Provides the most permanent form of CO ₂ storage. - Enhances storage security by chemically binding CO ₂	- Slowest trapping mechanism. - Dependent on geochemical conditions and mineral availability

3. METHODOLOGY AND SIMULATION SETUP

CMG (*Computer Modelling Group Ltd., 2023*) is used for this study. Among 13 of its products, GEM, Builder, cEdit, CMOST, and Results have been used to simulation setup, solving the system and analysis of result.

3.1 Structural and Petrophysical Modeling of Reservoir

Initially two reservoirs were modeled for the simulation. One is homogenous and the other is heterogenous. Both reservoirs are defined within a 3D Cartesian grid, delineating its structural and petrophysical attributes essential for CO₂ storage simulation. The model is structured into a 20×20×24 grid, translating into 9600 cells, with a uniform lateral cell dimension of 150 meters across both the X- and Y-axes which

resulted in 3000 m × 3000 m reservoir dimensions. Vertically, each cell exhibits a consistent thickness of 8.8 m, summing up to a reservoir thickness of approximately 211 m. The reservoir top boundary is placed at a depth of 1200 m below the surface, establishing the initial conditions for simulation purposes. The other properties and initial conditions of the homogenous reservoir are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Data used in the reservoir model

Property	Values
Porosity	12%
Permeability (Layers 1-3)	0 millidarcies (mD)
Permeability (Horizontal)	1000 millidarcies (mD)
Permeability (Vertical)	100 millidarcies (mD)
Initial Reservoir Pressure	11800 kpa
Initial Reservoir Temperature	70°C
Compressibility Factor	5.5E-7 1/psi
Water saturation	25%
Reference depth	1200 m
Water-oil contact depth	1300 m

Porosity and permeability data of the grid cells in the heterogenous reservoir are presented in Fig. 1 which is the 3D grid view of a heterogenous reservoir.




Fig. 1. Heterogenous reservoir showing a) porosity b) vertical permeability c) horizontal permeability d) water saturation.

The relative permeability data used for the study is presented in Fig. 2.

3.2 Well (CO₂ Injector) Modeling

A well is characterized as an injection well, with the purpose of injecting a solvent composed entirely of pure CO₂. The operational parameters are governed by constraints implemented through a continuous repeat command to maintain stability and control over the injection process. These constraints are defined as follows: a maximum surface gas injection rate (STG) of 50,000 m³/day, a maximum allowable bottom hole pressure (BHP) of 30,000 kPa, an injection period set to continue for 30 years, and a total simulation period of 200 years. Perforations have been done through three cells with coordinates (1,1,18), (1,1,19), and (1,1,20).




Fig. 2. Water-oil relative permeability curve.

3.3 Simulation Cases

Two types of reservoirs, homogenous and heterogenous, were studied for achieving the objective of this study. Table 3 presents the parameters used in all case studies done in the homogenous reservoir. The other properties will follow the base case described until this chapter.

Table 3. Simulation cases for homogenous reservoir

Case No.	Injection rate m ³ /d	Permeability X axis (mD)	Permeability Y axis (mD)	Permeability Z axis (mD)
5	50000	1000	1000	100
6	60000	1000	1000	100
7	70000	1000	1000	100
8	50000	1500	1500	50
9	50000	600	600	600
10	50000	100	100	100

In contrast, heterogenous reservoir have less freedom to change the parameters as the reservoir was considered as a predetermined property as it naturally is. This study, however, conducted some simulations by changing injection rate which are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Simulation cases for heterogenous reservoir

Case No.	Injection rate (m ³ /d)
1	50000
2	60000
3	70000
4	80000

Sensitivity analysis was done with CMOST which performs effect estimation by using Design of Experiments (DoE) to systematically vary input parameters and run multiple simulations. It constructs a response surface to model the relationship between inputs and outputs, and conducts sensitivity analysis to quantify the impact of each parameter on the results (Wang et al., 2023). The range of parameter values used in the CMOST sensitivity analysis for the homogenous reservoir are shown in Table 5. In total 36 experiments were selected by CMOST AI within these parameter ranges. The objective function taken in the CMOST study are as follows:

- 1) Trapped CO₂ (due to structural and residual trapping).
- 2) Dissolved CO₂ mol (solubility trapping).

Table 5. Range of parameter values for sensitivity analysis

Parameter Name	Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Injection Rate	50000 m ³ /day	100000 m ³ /day
Bottom Hole Pressure	25000 KPa	37500 KPa
Horizontal Permeability	300 mD	1500 mD
Vertical Permeability	100 mD	1000 mD
Porosity	9%	15%

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The primary objective of the study is to analyze the dynamics of CO₂ plume and to assess the roles played by various trapping mechanisms, along with investigating the influence of various reservoir characteristics on the plume development and storage efficiency. The primary objective is achieved through the following objectives: investigating the size of the CO₂ plume under different conditions, examining how the plume develops over time with continuous extended CO₂ injection, evaluating the effect of different CO₂ trapping methods in terms of storage, and conducting a sensitivity analysis to determine the impact of various reservoir parameters on the stored CO₂.

4.1 Plume Dynamics

An important element of CO₂ storage in an aquifer involves identifying the area of the aquifer surrounding the injection well that is affected by CO₂ injection. This affected region is referred to as the CO₂ plume. In this work, the criterion used to define the plume is based on the molality of CO₂ (Zapata et al., 2020). Because among all other criterion that generally used to define plume, CO₂ in aqueous phase spread across the aquifer region most, resulting in the maximum possible plume volume (Zapata et al., 2020). Cells exhibiting a CO₂ molality greater than the threshold of 0.4 are considered active within the plume.

In this study, plume volume is defined based on the pore volume of affected cells which are satisfying the threshold values of molality. So, the plume volume is not referring to pure CO₂ volume. Figure 3 is a plot of plume volume with respect to the time for both heterogenous and homogenous reservoirs. In the heterogeneous reservoir, the plume volume initially increases rapidly, indicative of varied pathways that facilitate quicker CO₂ spread through regions of higher permeability. In contrast, the plume in the homogeneous reservoir expands more gradually and uniformly, reflecting the consistent geological properties that regulate a steadier CO₂ migration. Despite these initial differences in growth rates, both scenarios eventually start to stabilize after the injection period ends. Additionally, Figure 4 is a graphical representation of the development of plume in a consistent CO₂ injection where the plume is defined based on the aqueous phase CO₂ as a function of total CO₂ injected with an injection rate of 50000 m³/day in standard condition. In both cases it can be observed that the plume develops almost in a linear trend with the injected CO₂ and the development continues even after the injection stops. This continuation generally occurred by the buoyancy force or molecular diffusion. But these stabilized quickly after the injection period ended.




Fig. 3. Plume volume with time (years) in (a) homogenous reservoir (b) heterogenous reservoir.




Fig. 4. Volume of CO₂ plume with total CO₂ injected in (a) homogenous (b) heterogenous reservoir where plume is defined based on CO₂ in aqueous phase.

Studying plume geometry and its evolution is another objective in this study. Figure 5 illustrates how the plume shape changes over time in different scenarios cases in a homogenous reservoir. The development of the plume is influenced by the structural and layered composition of the formation. The irregular plume shape of a heterogenous reservoir with various injection rates is presented in Fig. 6. It can be stated from the figures that in case 7 with high injection rate (70000 m³/day), the plume spread cross vertical direction is larger than the other case. Additionally, in case 10, the case of low permeability (100 mD in each direction), shows almost a very small but dense CO₂ plume as gas cannot move freely due to very low permeability.




Fig. 5. Plume evolution after different time for several cases in a homogenous reservoir.




Fig. 6. Plume evolution after different time for different cases in a heterogenous reservoir.

It can be implied that CO₂ plume is developing quickly in both vertical and horizontal direction during the injection period, then horizontal expansion rate becomes larger than the vertical. The permeability of the reservoir plays a critical role for the behavior of the plume evolution. At the very beginning of the injection period the injected CO₂ spreads vertically due to buoyancy-driven flow and initial pressure gradient with reservoir depth. Eventually, the horizontal propagation rate starts to increase as the horizontal permeability is 10 times larger than the vertical permeability. However, the propagation rate varies with the injection rate and permeability values. For example, plume evolution in case 10, with permeability value of 100 mD in each direction, has almost equal rate of propagation in both horizontal and vertical direction and the molality variation across the plume cells tends to be very low.

The heterogenous reservoir also shows a similar trend of plume propagation. As the reservoir has larger permeability

value in horizontal direction, the plume propagates mostly horizontally. So, the radial expansion will prevail over the vertical expansion. As a result, a larger plume volume is generated after 200 years where the average CO₂ molality is reduced but the spreader plume volume results in a larger surface area of the CO₂-brine and interaction between CO₂ and rock.

4.2 Storage Efficiency

This chapter is focused on the impact of various trapping mechanisms in the geological storage of CO₂ in the aquifers. CO₂ is stored in two forms of super critical CO₂ and aqueous phase CO₂ due to solubility trapping mechanism. However, super critical CO₂ can be found in two different conditions of mobile free phase CO₂ and immobilized CO₂ by structural and residual trapping mechanism.

To compare the contributions of various trapping mechanisms over a period of 200 years, a metric known as the "storage ratio" has been established. The storage ratio is defined as the proportion of stored CO₂ (in moles) to the total injected CO₂ (in moles) expressed by: (Zapata et al., 2020).

$$\text{Storage ratio} = \frac{\text{CO}_2 \text{ stored due to that specific trapping mechanism (moles)}}{\text{Injected CO}_2 \text{ (mol)}} \quad (3)$$

The storage ratios for each mechanism across both type of reservoirs (case 1 and case 5) is presented in Fig. 7. At the initial stage, structural, residual, and solubility trapping shows a huge storage ratio which drastically falls as the injection of CO₂ continues and the system allows the CO₂ to move. On the other hand, mobile free phase CO₂ drastically increased and stabilized at the storage ratio around 0.9.

The scenario is elaborated in Fig. 8. It is visible that the amount of structurally and residually trapped CO₂ (red color) increases rapidly until the injection period ends, then it gets eclipsed by the solubility trapping (orange color). Because more CO₂ can move through the reservoir freely and get chance to be dissolved more in the aquifer. Moreover, some mobile free phase super critical CO₂ is also being dissolved over time which makes a negative slope in mobile free phase CO₂ curve too. As a result, even if the slope of solubility trapping curve is not too steep at the beginning but that positive slope holds with a close value throughout the long-term period.

The contribution of different trapping mechanisms in both homogenous and heterogenous reservoirs (case 1 and case 5) is presented in Fig. 9 as a stacked area diagram. It can be observed that the largest portion of CO₂ is retained as mobile CO₂ in the free phase. The ratio of mobile CO₂ rises rapidly throughout the injection phase; nonetheless, upon discontinuation of injection, the significance of alternative trapping mechanisms is amplified, leading to a decline in the mobile CO₂ fraction.




Fig. 7. Contribution of (a) mobile free phase CO₂ (b) residual and structural trapping and (c) solubility trapping in a homogenous and heterogenous reservoir in terms of storage ratio with time.




Fig. 8. Injected and stored CO₂ amount (mol) in (a) homogenous and (b) heterogenous case.

4.3 Sensitivity Analysis

CMOST AI, an updated module was used in the sensitivity analysis. Response Surface Methodology (RSM) was employed to evaluate the effects of various operational parameters on the amount of trapped and dissolved CO₂. RSM comprises statistical and mathematical techniques for exploratory experiments aimed at developing, analyzing, and optimizing various processes (Bauer Jr. et al., 1999). RSM is particularly useful and efficient in performing sensitivity

analyses for decision-making problems, offering a way to notably shorten the time required to conduct these analyses (Bauer Jr. et al., 1999). In this study, the parameters considered include bottom hole pressure (kPa), injection rate (m³/day), horizontal permeability (mD), vertical permeability (mD), and porosity. The objective functions considered are trapped CO₂ and dissolved CO₂.




Fig. 9. Contribution of different trapping mechanism in (a) homogenous reservoir (b) heterogenous reservoir.

The charts displayed in Figs. 10 and 11 show the normalized impact of each parameter against the maximum effect value observed in our models.

From the analysis, it is evident that certain parameters are particularly influential, which are described in the following. The sensitivity analysis for trapped CO₂ reveals several key insights:

- 1) The horizontal permeability shows the most substantial positive quadratic effect, indicating that higher horizontal permeability increases CO₂ trapping significantly.
- 2) Although injection rate is positively impacting the trapped CO₂ amount, it has a negative quadratic impact which shows that after a certain level, the trapped CO₂ will decrease with the increase in injection rate.
- 3) The squared term of bottom hole pressure also positively affects CO₂ trapping.
- 4) Porosity and its squared value moderately influence CO₂ trapping, indicating that more porous formations tend to trap more CO₂.

The analysis of dissolved CO₂ presented in Fig. 11 indicates that porosity exhibits the strongest positive effect on the dissolution of CO₂ into the reservoir fluids. Higher porosity levels enhance the capacity for CO₂ dissolution, due to the increased fluid interactions within porous media. Then both injection rate and horizontal permeability positively impact CO₂ dissolution.




Fig. 10. Relative impact of different parameters on structural and residually trapped CO₂.




Fig. 11. Relative impact of different parameters on dissolved CO₂ amount (moles).

5. CONCLUSIONS

CO₂ plume dynamics, storage capacity, and impact of different reservoir properties and parameters were explored in this study. The results show that horizontal plume spread exceeds vertical due to higher horizontal permeability. Case studies showed that permeability and injection rate significantly influence plume volume, with higher rates and permeabilities resulting in larger plumes. Additionally, the plume volume shows a linear relationship with the injected CO₂ amount. In terms of storage efficiency, the most prevalent CO₂ is free phase super critical CO₂ that contributes around 80% of the stored CO₂ whereas the rest are structurally or residually trapped and dissolved CO₂. Initially, trapped CO₂ contributed almost 15%. Over time, some of the trapped CO₂ dissolved into the reservoir or aquifer fluid. This led to a reduction in the percentage contribution to structural and residual trapping mechanisms, decreasing to 5% in homogeneous reservoirs and 0% in heterogeneous reservoirs. At the same time, the percentage contributed to solubility trapping increased to 15% in homogeneous reservoirs and 20% in heterogeneous reservoirs. Sensitivity analyses revealed that horizontal permeability and injection rate significantly affect trapped CO₂, while porosity impacts CO₂ dissolution. The Future research should incorporate more realistic reservoir models, explore mineral trapping, and conduct further sensitivity analyses.

REFERENCES

- Aakre, H., Mathiesen, V., and Moldestad, B. (2018). Performance of CO₂ flooding in a heterogeneous oil reservoir using autonomous inflow control. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 167, 654–663. doi:10.1016/j.petrol.2018.04.008
- Ahmed, T. (2010). Chapter 14—Principles of Waterflooding. In T. Ahmed (Ed.), *Reservoir Engineering Handbook (Fourth Edition)* (pp. 909–1095). Gulf Professional Publishing. doi:10.1016/B978-1-85617-803-7.50022-5
- Al-Khdheawi, E. A., Vialle, S., Barifcani, A., Sarmadivaleh, M., and Iglauer, S. (2018). Effect of wettability heterogeneity and reservoir temperature on CO₂ storage efficiency in deep saline aquifers. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 68, 216–229. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2017.11.016
- Bachu, S. (2008). CO₂ storage in geological media: Role, means, status and barriers to deployment. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 34(2), 254–273.
- Bauer Jr., K. W., Parnell, G. S., and Meyers, D. A. (1999). Response surface methodology as a sensitivity analysis tool in decision analysis. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 8(3), 162–180. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1360(199905)8:3<162::AID-MCDA241>3.0.CO;2-X
- Birkholzer, J. T., Oldenburg, C. M., and Zhou, Q. (2015). CO₂ migration and pressure evolution in deep saline aquifers. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 40, 203–220. doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.03.022
- Computer Modelling Group Ltd. (2023). [Computer software]. CMG. <https://www.cmg.ca/>
- Godec, M., Kuuskraa, V., Van Leeuwen, T., Stephen Melzer, L., and Wildgust, N. (2011). CO₂ storage in depleted oil fields: The worldwide potential for carbon dioxide enhanced oil recovery. *Energy Procedia*, 4, 2162–2169. doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2011.02.102
- Ketzer, J. M., Iglesias, R. S., and Einloft, S. (2012). Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions with CO₂ Capture and Geological Storage. In W.-Y. Chen, J. Seiner, T. Suzuki, and M. Lackner (Eds.), *Handbook of Climate Change Mitigation* (pp. 1405–1440). Springer US. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7991-9_37
- Kulynycz, V. (2015). The influence of wettability on oil recovery. *AGH Drilling, Oil, Gas*, 32, 493. doi:10.7494/drill.2015.32.3.493
- Luo, A., Li, Y., Chen, X., Zhu, Z., and Peng, Y. (2022). Review of CO₂ sequestration mechanism in saline aquifers. *Natural Gas Industry B*, 9(4), 383–393. doi:10.1016/j.ngib.2022.07.002
- Moritis, G. (2006). CO₂ injection gains momentum. *Oil and Gas Journal*, 104, 37–41.
- Myshakin, E. M., Haeri, F., Moore, J., Crandall, D., and Goodman, A. L. (2023). Numerical Simulations of Carbon Dioxide Storage Efficiency in Heterogeneous Reservoir Models. *Geofluids*, 2023, 5089508. doi:10.1155/2023/5089508
- Raza, A., Rezace, R., Gholami, R., Rasouli, V., Bing, C. H., Nagarajan, R., and Hamid, M. A. (2015). Injectivity and quantification of capillary trapping for CO₂ storage: A review of influencing parameters. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering*, 26, 510–517. doi:10.1016/j.jngse.2015.06.046
- Riddiford, F., Tourqui, A., Bishop, C., Taylor, B., and Smith, M. (2003). *A cleaner development: The In Salah Gas project, Algeria*. 595–600.
- Saedi, A. (2012). *Experimental study of multiphase flow in porous media during CO₂ Geo-Sequestration processes*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Szulczewski, M. L. (2013). *The Subsurface Fluid Mechanics of Geologic Carbon Dioxide Storage* by.
- Taghavi, S., Tahami, S. A., Aakre, H., Furuvik, N. C. I., and Moldestad, B. M. E. (2023). Performance Analysis of Autonomous Inflow Control Valve in a Heterogenous Reservoir Using CO₂ Enhanced Oil Recovery. *Day 3 Wed, October 18, 2023*, D031S045R002. doi:10.2118/215153-MS
- Torp, T. A., and Gale, J. (2003). *Demonstrating storage of CO₂ in geological reservoirs: The Sleipner and SACS projects*. 311–316.
- Van Der Meer, B. (2005). Carbon Dioxide Storage in Natural Gas Reservoir. *Oil & Gas Science and Technology*, 60(3), 527–536. doi.org/10.2516/ogst:2005035
- Verma, Y., Vishal, V., and Ranjith, P. G. (2021). Sensitivity Analysis of Geomechanical Constraints in CO₂ Storage to Screen Potential Sites in Deep Saline Aquifers. *Frontiers in Climate*, 3, 720959. doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2021.720959
- Wang, Y., Luo, J., and Shang, Z. (2023). Sensitivity Analysis of Oil and Gas Production in the In Situ Pyrolysis of Oil Shale. *Processes*, 11(7). doi.org/10.3390/pr11071948
- Whittaker, S., Wilson, M., and Monea, M. (2004). *IEA GHG Weyburn CO₂ monitoring & storage project summary report 2000-2004: From the proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies : September 5-9, Vancouver, Canada : Volume III*. Petroleum Technology Research Centre.
- Zapata, Y., Kristensen, M. R., Huerta, N., Brown, C., Kabir, C. S., and Reza, Z. (2020). CO₂ geological storage: Critical insights on plume dynamics and storage efficiency during long-term injection and post-injection periods. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering*, 83, 103542. doi:10.1016/j.jngse.2020.103542
- Zhi, S., Elsworth, D., and Liu, L. (2019). W-shaped permeability evolution of coal with supercritical CO₂ phase transition. *International Journal of Coal Geology*, 211, 103221. doi:10.1016/j.coal.2019.103221