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ABSTRACT: An innovative methodology for diagenesis characterization and quantification is presented. It includes different geostatistical modeling workflows applied to a partially dolomitized carbonate platform. The case study consists of a Lower Cretaceous (upper Aptian) shallow-water carbonate platform from the Basque–Cantabrian basin (northern Spain), in which a widespread burial dolomitization occurs. Previous studies at basin scale suggested that the flow of dolomitizing fluids through the carbonate succession was channeled by regional faults and that subsequently the dolomite distribution was partially controlled by depositional facies and their modifications after early meteoric diagenesis. Here, at reservoir scale, several carbonate facies were differentiated and grouped in five depositional environments. Two depositional sequences corresponding to transgressive-regressive cycles and three stages of the platform evolution were distinguished.

The statistical data treatment indicated that the dolomitization is mainly concentrated in the regressive part of the first sequence, corresponding to the second stage of the platform evolution. The most dolomitized environments are the inner platforms and the shoal. Facies from these shallow/proximal depositional environments were more exposed to early meteoric diagenesis, possibly controlling later dolomitization.

The total macroscopic porosity is directly proportional to the degree of dolomitization: pores are most abundant in fully dolomitized portions of the succession, particularly in the rudist-bearing and grain-dominated facies. Abundant aragonitic shells (rudists, corals), easily leached or recrystallized during early meteoric diagenesis, could justify the higher moldic porosity in these facies.

For geostatistical modeling purposes, several statistical rules were elaborated in order to associate to each depositional environment, in each of the three platform stages, different proportions of dolomitization and related pore abundance. A direct simulation of the distribution of depositional environments, degree of dolomitization, and pore abundance was achieved using a bi-plurigaussian simulation (PGS) algorithm. A nested-PGS algorithm was used to simulate the same parameters independently: dolomite and pore abundance were distributed within each depositional environment, based on the statistical rules previously defined. These simulations allowed three-dimensional (3D) visualization of the original depositional facies and textures affecting the distribution of dolomitization and pore abundance.

Modeling using both bi-PGS and nested simulations accounted for the 3D dolomite body extension: the dolomitized succession is thicker in the north and thins toward the south, in agreement with evidence from mapping of the dolomite geobodies.
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INTRODUCTION

The quality evolution of carbonate reservoirs may strongly depend on depositional environments and associated facies, with their intrinsic textures and primary mineralogy (Moore 2001, Ali et al. 2010, Morad et al. 2012, Nader 2015). These syn-sedimentary features may induce different early diagenetic evolutions, which in turn are commonly reflected in the distribution of burial diagenetic overprints. In particular, carbonate reservoirs are characterized by significant complexity due to their high reactivity potential, which may induce changes of the initial reservoir properties through various diagenetic processes (i.e., Morrow and MacIreath 1990, Moore 2001). Dolomitization is a common diagenetic process affecting carbonate reservoirs, and numerous studies have focused on the origin of dolomites in different settings (see Warren [2000] and Machel [2004] for a review). Understanding the petrophysical changes induced in the original lithologies by dolomitization is a crucial topic in hydrocarbon exploration as a result of the possible development of secondary porosity associated with the dolomitization process (i.e., Sun 1995, Saller and Handerson 1998, Morad et al. 2012).

Through the proposed workflows and the use of innovative simulation methods, this study contributes to the need to develop modeling approaches that take into account the interplay between syn-sedimentary features and subsequent diagenetic events, aiming to better predict the overall distribution of reservoir heterogeneities. In order to acquire strong knowledge of the factors governing the heterogeneities in dolomitic reservoirs, it is necessary to characterize their properties at different scales (basin, reservoir, plug, thin section) and with multiple approaches (characterization, quantification, modeling). The geological uncertainty, particularly as it regards petrophysical property distribution in dolomitic reservoirs, could indeed be reduced using geological modeling, which implies systematic treatment of the characterization data. Indeed, through sensitivity analysis, quantitative diagenesis properties can be added to the set of unknown parameters, allowing a better estimate of uncertainties.

Presently, three different numerical approaches are mainly used to simulate diagenesis in geological models: geometry-based, geochemical, or geostatistical approaches (Nader 2017). Geometry-based models provide geometric distribution of heterogeneities as karstification or fracture-related diagenesis. Geochemical modeling uses thermodynamic and kinetic rules to simulate fluid–rock interactions. Finally, geostatistical methods may be used to provide possible distributions of reservoir property heterogeneities. This work will focus on the use of geostatistical methods in workflows consistent with the data properties, interdependencies, proxies, and facies–diagenesis relationships in order to provide a pertinent distribution of the petrophysical properties (here macroporosities) within reservoirs.

A wide range of geostatistical methods and algorithms dedicated to lithotype simulations have been developed in the past; they can be ranked from pixel-based (Sequential Gaussian, Truncated Gaussian, Sequential Bayesian Simulations) to object- or process-based models (Journel and Isaaks 1984, Matheron et al. 1987, Srivastava 1993, Galli and Beucher 1997, Armstrong et al. 2011, Strebelle and Cavelius 2014 [among others]). Some of these methods have recently been used to simulate sedimentary facies and associated diagenesis overprints (Labourdette 2007, Pontiggia et al. 2010, Barbier et al. 2011, Doligez et al. 2011, Blázquez-Fernández 2013, Gasparri et al. 2015, Hamon et al. 2015) and have shown how essential it is to account for quantitative relationships between the depositional lithofacies and the overprinting diagenetic phases (e.g., cements, dissolution, replacement) in order to obtain a consistent distribution of petrophysical properties in the reservoirs. Indeed, one key point for successful reservoir modeling has been demonstrated to be the quantitative integration of the diagenetic overprint in the sedimentary model (Labourdette 2007, Pontiggia et al. 2010).

A Lower Cretaceous (upper Aptian) shallow-water carbonate platform from the northwestern Basque–Cantabrian basin (northern Spain), affected by widespread burial dolomitization, was chosen as the case study. Previous diagenetic studies at basin scale (López-Cilla 2009; López-Cilla et al. 2009, 2013, 2016) suggested that regional faults played a role in channeling the dolomitizing fluids through the platform carbonate pile and that depositional facies and their modifications after early meteoric diagenesis could have further controlled the distribution of burial dolomitization. These working hypotheses formulated at basin scale were tested at the reservoir scale via a complete modeling workflow including field and subsurface data acquisition, statistics of sedimentary–diagenetic properties, and their geostatistical simulation (Fig. 1).

A manageable field–work area was selected in the studied basin, where vertical and lateral relationships between dolomite and original depositional facies can be observed and where shallow subsurface mine cores, provided by the Instituto Geológico y Minero de España (IGME) are available. The aim was to investigate the main controls on the distribution of dolomitization and the effects on the reservoir properties by testing an innovative methodology of diagenesis characterization and quantification, as well as different geostatistical approaches. The entire workflow included several tasks: from field and subsurface data acquisition (stratigraphic logs and facies analysis) to the construction of a geometrical model and from statistical characterization of sedimentary and diagenetic properties (using a log processing tool for well data treatment) to their geostatistical modeling (using advanced geological property grid simulation algorithms).

GEOLOGICAL SETTING

Paleogeography and Tectonics

The study area is located in the northwestern margin of the Basque–Cantabrian basin (Fig. 2), in the Cantabria Community of northern Spain. Geologically, this region has been referred to as the North-Cantabrian basin (Wünsen 2000, 2005; Martin-Chivelet et al. 2002; Najarro et al. 2007), which formed during the Mesozoic–Early Cenozoic by continental rifting linked to the opening of the Bay of Biscay and the North Atlantic Ocean (Le Pichon and Sibuet 1971, Rat
As a result of the extensional movements, the North-Cantabrian basin underwent strong structural segmentation in a series of horsts and tilted blocks, mainly outlined by syn-sedimentary NE–SW, and E–W oriented faults (Najarro 2015; Fig. 2), which created subbasins and controlled differential subsidence and variations in facies, thicknesses, and stratigraphy over short distances during the Early Cretaceous. These subbasins were filled by syn-rift continental and epicontinental, transitional, and shallow-marine deposits. The studied sections form part of the Lower Cretaceous succession of the Santillana block, a depocentral area flanked by the Bustriguado and Peña Castillo fault systems, with relatively less subsident paleo-highs in the La Florida and Cuchía blocks (Najarro 2015; Fig. 2).

Postrift deposition occurred during the Late Cretaceous and formed a transgressive ramp succession with mainly shallow to outer carbonate platform deposition. Subsequently, basin inversion resulted from convergence between the Iberian and European plates from Santonian to Miocene times. According to the geological data, in the North-Cantabrian basin, the first compressive phases were recorded in the Upper Eocene (Hines 1985, Rat 1988).

**General Stratigraphy**

As a result of tectonics and eustasy, the North-Cantabrian basin was flooded during the Early Aptian, transforming vast areas formerly characterized by terrigenous deposition (Wealden facies) into shallow marine environments (Rat 1988). This transgression gave rise to the development of widespread carbonate deposition during the Aptian, resulting in the so-called “Urgonian complex” (Rat 1959, Garcia-Mondejar 1990). Carbonate rocks belonging to the Urgonian complex...
consist of shallow-water rudist and coral-dominated limestones with lateral and vertical transitions to continental-transitional siliciclastics and to deeper-water intraplatform basinal marlstones and other basinal sediments (e.g., Rosales 1999).

In the Urgonian complex of the North-Cantabrian basin four main carbonate platform episodes were recorded during the earliest Aptian (Rábago and Umbrera formations [Fms.]; early Bedulian), late Early Aptian (San Esteban Fm., late Bedulian), Late Aptian (Reocín Fm., middle Gargasian–Clansayesian), and Middle–Late Albian (Barcena-
ciones Fm.) (Hines 1985, Najarro et al. 2011, Najarro 2015, Schlagintweit et al. 2016; Fig. 3). Each of these platform stages was capped by subaerial unconformities followed by transgressive marly and siliciclastic deposits. Major regression in the area during the Early Albian, on the top of the Reocín Fm., resulted in widespread platform exposure, with development of paleokarst, and local progradation of deltaic deposits of the Las Peñosas Fm. (Najarro 2015; Fig. 3). Detailed lithological descriptions and age information for these stratigraphic formations are given by previous authors (e.g., García-Mondejar 1982, Hines 1985, Najarro et al. 2011, Najarro 2015, Schlagintweit et al. 2016).

Dolomite Bodies of the Reocín Fm

This work focuses on the late Aptian Reocín Fm. (7–300 m thick), which consists mainly of shallow-marine wackestone and packstone characterized by the occurrence of rudists, corals, miliolids, orbitolinids, and other benthic foraminifers (e.g., Martin-Chivelet et al. 2002, Najarro et al. 2007, Schlagintweit et al. 2016). The studied sections are located in the depocentral Santillana block (Fig. 4). Here, the Reocín Fm. shows a mean sedimentary thickness of about 210 m, and it is internally subdivided into two carbonate platforms transgressive-regressive sequences (Najarro et al. 2007, Najarro 2015). Only the first sequence and the lower part of the second sequence have been analyzed in this study, which deals with burial, tan to brown-colored, stratabound dolostone bodies, extending laterally for several tens of kilometers. The dolomites preferentially replaced the first carbonate sequence of the Reocín Fm. and particularly its central part (Fig. 4). Previous diagenetic studies at basin scale suggested that the dolomitizing fluids were channeled through the carbonate succession by the main regional NE–SW and E–W oriented faults. Subsequently, a control on the distribution of the burial dolomitization was operated by depositional facies and their modifications after early meteoric diagenesis (López-Cilla 2009; López-Cilla et al. 2009, 2013, 2016). Detailed petrography, geochemistry, and microthermometry suggested a burial genesis for the massive dolomitization (e.g., López-Cilla et al. 2016). The dolomites pervasively replaced matrix, grains, fossils, and early cements. In the study area, however, the dolomitization is partly fabric-retentive (mimetic), preserving the main depositional features, such as textures, grain size, and fossil relics (rudists, orbitolinids, and other bioclasts). At present, these dolostone bodies comprise the main regional aquifer and represent analogues for good-quality oil and gas reservoirs as a result of the presence of various amounts of intercrystalline, moldic, and vuggy pores. Additionally, these pores may host Mississippi Valley–Type Pb–Zn mineral deposits (Reocín Mine District; Bustillo and Ordoñez 1985, Velasco et al. 2003).

DATABASE AND METHODOLOGY

In this study, prior to modeling the spatial distribution of carbonate facies, amount of dolomitization, and reservoir properties, a comprehensive characterization of the studied succession was performed. The methodology included detailed logging and description of field sections and well-cores (both hereafter referred to as “wells”), statistical analyses of the well attributes, and, finally, three-dimensional (3D) geostatistical modeling of the different properties.
Field-work Database

Sedimentological and diagenetic descriptions that constitute the database of this study have been made on six stratigraphic sections logged along the first sequence and the transgressive part of the second sequence of the Reocín Fm. (location map from satellite image in Fig. 5): four outcrop sections (named, from W to E, Duña, Santa Eulalia, Nieves Base, and Nieves Top) and two well-cores (named SC1 and SC6bis) located north of the outcrop area and drilled by the mine company Asturiana del Zinc S.A. The cores are stored in the IGME core repository (Peharroya).

A classical field and core description methodology for each section has been followed: lithology, textures (sensu Dunham 1962), sedimentary structures, fossil content, and surfaces were recorded. The sections have been logged by including also the description and visual quantification of diagenetic properties on hand specimen fresh cuts (for outcrop sections) and on polished slabs (for core sections). The degree of dolomitization and the dolomite crystal size, as well as the type, size, and abundance of macroscopic pores, were also reported. Diluted HCl and magnification lenses helped in this respect. Intercrystalline, moldic, and vuggy pores were distinguished based on the Choquette and Pray (1970) classification, while fractures (and related porosity) were not reported in the logs. Sedimentological and paleoenvironmental interpretations were based on these field observations. Fifty rock samples were collected with specific focus on facies and diagenetic property changes. Conventional optical petrography was accomplished on thin sections and used for a quality check of the macroscopic visual estimations reported on the logs.

Statistical Analysis

The descriptive properties derived from the macroscopic observations (e.g., facies, dolomite abundance, pore size, etc.) of the six logged sections (here also referred to as “wells”) were converted into numerical codes. These codes served as input in the EasyTrace™ software in order to transform the original data set into quantitative and semiquantitative data and to achieve the statistical analysis. Using EasyTrace™, multivariate statistical analysis on the whole data set has allowed us to highlight the links between depositional facies and the diagenetic properties of interest and their mutual relationships.

Geostatistical Modeling

Geostatistical modeling workflows have been used to simulate sedimentary facies and associated diagenesis overprints (as proposed by Doligez et al. 2009, 2011; Pontiggia et al. 2010; Hamon et al. 2015). The statistical analysis produced quantitative statistical
distributions of properties within the different depositional facies and environments. These statistics have been used to calibrate parameters for the geostatistical simulations. In this work, we have used two different workflows (using in-house advanced geostatistical property simulation algorithms) to achieve the final goal of producing a numerical model of the studied reservoir with consistent facies, depositional environments, dolomitization, and macroporosity properties.

A first workflow (named “Workflow1” or “double-nested workflow”; Fig. 6) was built to better illustrate the distribution of dolomitization and pore abundance in the studied area from simulations of the distribution of depositional environments and diagenetic property quantification. Each consecutive step of the workflow is represented in Figure 6. Since depositional environments, degree of dolomitization (i.e., amount of dolomite), and pore abundance have been proven by the previously undertaken statistical study to be three dependent properties, the workflow integrates three main steps dedicated to the simulation of each of these properties within each of the identified sedimentary units in a double-nested approach, as follows:

- **Step 1**—Simulation of the distribution of depositional environments using bi-plurigaussian simulation (PGS);
- **Step 2**—Simulation of the distribution of the amount of dolomite, depending on the depositional environment, using a nested approach (PGS simulation of the amount of dolomite within each depositional environment); and
- **Step 3**—Simulation of the pore abundance, depending on the amount of dolomite and the depositional environment, using a second step of nested PGS simulation.

A second workflow (named “Workflow2” or “bi-PGS workflow”; Fig. 7) has been tested using combinations of two plurigaussian simulations to co-simulate dependent properties (bi-PGS). The general idea is to generate a model of the depositional environment distribution that can be controlled by the conceptual geological knowledge using a PGS method. The diagenetic imprint distribution (degree of dolomitization in this case) is generated using the
quantified proportions between the initial rock textures and their subsequent alteration (diagenesis) and a second PGS simulation, the parameters of which are conditioned by the association rules between depositional environments and diagenetic properties of interest. Using this second plurigaussian simulation means that continuity in the diagenetic property from one cell to another can be obtained, even if the sedimentary facies changes between these cells (which would not be possible with a nested approach; Doligez et al. 2011).

RESULTS OF SEDIMENTOLOGY AND STRATIGRAPHY

Based on the information collected along the six detailed sedimentological logs investigated, a facies analysis study was performed, different conceptual depositional models were established, and a sequential correlation was accomplished.

Facies Analysis

Sixteen depositional lithofacies plus two diagenetic lithofacies (excluding dolomitization) have been distinguished throughout the logged sections of the Reocín Fm. (18 lithofacies in total; see Table 1). The 16 depositional lithofacies have been defined based on macroscopic observations of lithology, texture, allochems, paleontological constituents, and sedimentary structures, along with additional information obtained from microfacies analysis on thin sections.

Where the studied lithologies are dolomitized, the identification of the original depositional lithofacies is more complex but is still made possible by the relatively good preservation of original bedding, depositional structures and textures, and specific fossil components or molds. Thus, according to the preserved fabrics, six dolo-textures have been distinguished: dolo-mudstone, dolo-wackestone, dolo-packstone, dolo-grainstone, and dolo-rudstone (Fig. 8). For instance, the dolo-rudstone is the dolomitized equivalent of...
the rudist–boundstone facies. In the cores, two additional diagenetic lithofacies have been distinguished, where the original limestone texture could not be recognized: hydraulic breccias and dedolomite (H and D in Table 1). The latter includes strongly dedolomitized and weathered lithologies that could not be attributed to a specific depositional lithofacies. These two diagenetic lithofacies (hydraulic breccias and dedolomite) do not have any relationship to depositional lithofacies, and they have not been modeled. The limestone facies and their dolomitized equivalents have been grouped into four main classes based on the depositional or diagenetic fabrics: grain-supported (GS), mud-supported (MS), boundstone (BS), and diagenetic facies (D, H). The facies analysis information is summarized in Table 1 and Figure 8.

**Facies Associations and Depositional Environments**

The 16 depositional lithofacies identified have been grouped into five facies associations based on genetic facies relationships and depositional environments, as follows: outer platform (OP), transitional outer–inner platform (T), shoal (S), inner open platform (IO), and inner restricted platform (IR). The main characteristics of the lithofacies types comprising these facies associations are summarized in Table 1 and Figure 9.

**Outer Platform (OP):** Bioturbated marlstones and argillaceous nodular limestones (MS-5), laminated, fine grained peloidal–foraminiferal packstone (GS-1), orbitolinid-rich packstone (GS-2), and coral wackestone (MS-4) dominate this facies association. The most common skeletal components are orbitolinids, small benthic foraminifers, echinoderms, sponge spicules, oysters, and massive corals. This facies association is interpreted as being deposited in outer parts of the platform under low-energy hydrodynamic conditions. The presence of corals suggests water depth within the photic zone.

**Transitional Outer–Inner Platform (T):** This facies association consists of medium to fine grained packstone and grainstone with peloids and micritized grains, bioclasts, milliols, orbitolinids, small benthic foraminifers, coral fragments, and sponges (GS-4). It is interpreted as being deposited under moderate-energy hydrodynamic conditions.
conditions, in an open environment at the transition between the outer and the inner platform.

**Shoal (S):** It consists of wavy and cross-laminated, medium- to coarse-grained, bioclastic and intraclastic grainstone (GS-3). The main components include intraclasts, echinoderm debris, micritized grains, benthic foraminifers, bryozoans, crinoidal ossicles, bivalve and coral fragments, and quartz sand grains. The sedimentary structures and textures suggest a high-energy hydrodynamic environment above or close to the fair-weather wave base, most likely representing sand shoal complexes, with sand waves and sand channels, deposited in a shallow subtidal platform margin setting.

**Inner Open Platform (IO):** It is mainly composed of packstone and grainstone with miliolids (GS-5), corals (GS-6), *Lithocodium–Bacinella* lumps (GS-7), and rudstone of *Lithocodium–Bacinella* oncoids (GS-8). Frequent allochems in these lithofacies are branching corals (fragmented or in live position), miliolids, benthic foraminifers, and green codiacean and dasycladalean algae, as well as lumps and ameboïdal oncoids of the problematic *Lithocodium–Bacinella* calcifying cyanobacteria (Riding 1991). These lithofacies are stacked aggradationally at the upper part of the studied succession.

The presence of branching corals and green algae suggests shallow platform environments under normal-salinity seawater. The microbial *Lithocodium–Bacinella* facies have been reported in a wide range of water depth, from deep subtidal to shallowest subtidal

---

**Fig. 8.**—Textures identified from field and core observations. A, B) Dolomudstone in outcrop and core views, respectively; C, D) Dolo-floatstone, with rudist molds, in outcrop and core views, respectively; E, F) Dolo-rudstone with large rudist molds, in outcrop and core samples, respectively; G) Dolo-packstone, with orbitolinid molds, in a core sample; H) Dolo-grainstone in outcrop view with cross bedding.

**Fig. 9.**—Conceptual depositional models of the three stages of the platform evolution. Stage 1 is a transgressive, mainly grain-dominated open platform. Stage 2 is a regressive platform with inner restricted and shoal marginal environments. Stage 3 is characterized by transgressive open platform facies. Lithofacies colors and codes as in Table 1.
and even intertidal conditions, with maximum depth limited to the photic zone (Neuweiler and Reitner 1992, Rameil et al. 2010). Their proliferation has been associated with either shallow-water platform environments with open marine conditions (Hamdan and Alsharhan 1991) or open lagoonal environments under specific paleoceanographic conditions of high trophic levels (Immenhauser et al. 2005, Huck et al. 2010, Bover-Arnal et al. 2011). Here, according to the biotic assemblage, this facies association is interpreted as being deposited in inner open platform environments.

**Inner Restricted Platform (IR):** It is formed predominantly by muddy lithofacies that include foraminiferal wackestone–mudstone (MS-1), bio- and peloidal wackestone (MS-2), rudist and *Lithocodium–Bacinella* floatstone (MS-3), *Lithocodium–Bacinella* boundstone (BS-1), and rudist boundstone (BS-2). The rudist-dominated

---

**Fig. 10.—** Correlation diagram of the logged sections with interpretation of lateral and vertical distribution of depositional environments and depositional (T–R) sequences: transgressive (T), regressive (R), peak transgression (PT), peak regression (PR). Lithofacies colors and codes as in Table 1.
Lithofacies Trends and Sequences

Based on vertical-deepening and shallowing-upward trends of lithofacies and identification of some key stratigraphic surfaces, two transgressive-regressive (T–R) sequences (Vail et al. 1991, Embry 1993) have been recognized for the studied succession of the Reocín Fm. (Fig. 10). Below these two sequences (Sequences 1 and 2; Fig. 10), the most regressive part of an older depositional sequence, corresponding to the transition between the Rodezas and Reocín Fms., can also be observed.

Sequence 1 is approximately 85 m thick. It has a transgressive part that measures approximately 31 m, composed mainly of marlstone and marly limestone (MS-5) and orbitolinid packstone (GS-2), with sparse interbedded meter-scale intercalations of bioclastic-intraclastic grainstone (GS-3). The peak transgression is placed on the top of the thickest marly interval (PT1 in Figs. 4, 10). The regressive part is about 54 m thick and is characterized by rudist-bearing lithofacies (MS-3, BS-2) accompanied by nereid gastropod, peloidal, and foraminiferal wackestone (MS-1, MS-2, MS-6) and boundstone of Lithocodium–Bacinella masses (BS-1).

As a result of the lack of evidence for subaerial exposure, the boundary between Sequences 1 and 2 (PR in Fig. 10) is expressed by a change from inner-platform rudist-dominated facies to open platform orbitolinid-rich marlstones and coral and Lithocodium–Bacinella limestones.

Sequence 2 is at least 60 m thick, and only the transgressive part of the cycle is studied here (Fig. 10). These transgressive deposits are characterized by the occurrence of aggradational, grain-dominated deposits with extensive development of corals and Lithocodium–Bacinella lumps and oncoids (GS-5, GS-6, GS-7, GS-8). The maximum flooding zone (FT2 in Figs. 4, 10) has been placed within a marly bed with orbitolinids that constitutes the upper datum for correlation between the studied sections.

Three stages of platform evolution have been differentiated (Blázquez-Fernández 2013; Fig. 9). Stage 1 occurs during the transgressive phase of Sequence 1. It is characterized by T and OP environments dominated by marly and grain-supported lithofacies. Stage 2 characterizes the regressive phase of Sequence 1. It is characterized by IR or lagoonal environments with proliferation of rudist-bearing facies, and grain-dominated S environment toward marginal settings. Stage 3 occurred during the transgressive phase of Sequence 2. It is dominated by IO environments, deposited in a transgressive setting, characterized by grain-supported textures with coral and Lithocodium–Bacinella lumps (Fig. 10).

Using the whole facies analysis information, five paleoenvironmental maps were constructed: two for Stage 1, two for Stage 2, and one for Stage 3 (Blázquez-Fernández 2013). They were used to better constrain the modeling of the geological properties (see next sections).

RESULTS OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The statistical analysis was accomplished to highlight relationships and interdependence between the sedimentological and diagenetic parameters described during field-work: principally facies, depositional environments, dolomite abundance, and pore abundance. In order to enter the information from the field-work data set into the

### Table 2.—Tables summarizing the codes attributed to each property examined for statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facies</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Environments</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pore abundance</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Outer Platform (OP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transitional (T)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inner Restricted (IR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inner Open (IO)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rare or abundant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shal (S)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Common pores</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Common to abundant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rudist-rich (or bearing) facies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fully dolomitized lithologies</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS08</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faunal packstone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dolomite in the range of 0 to 10%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orbitolinid-rich facies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dolomite in the range of 50 to 75%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rudist-rich or bearing facies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lenticular (L)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dolomite in the range of 75 to 100% (including code 6)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lenticular (L)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dolomite in the range of 75 to 100% (including code 6)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Common to abundant</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Common to abundant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Common to abundant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Common to abundant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Medium-coarse grainstone</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EasyTrace™ software the classes established for each parameter were expressed using numerical codes (Table 2).

The original limestone lithofacies (Table 1) and their dolomitized counterparts have been distinguished for the statistical treatment in 21 facies classes (Table 2). These facies classes were grouped into five broader classes (referred to as “Facies Groups” in the figures and tables), mainly on the basis of the texture, grains size, and dominant bioclast. These are muddy facies (code 1), fine grained facies (code 2), medium-coarse grained facies (code 3), rudist-rich (or bearing) facies (code 4), and diagenetic facies (code 5).

The different depositional environments (referred to as “Environment” in the figures and tables) were coded as follows (Table 2): OP (code 1), T (code 2), IR (code 3), IO (code 4), and S (code 5).

For the amount of dolomite (referred to as “Dolo Quantity” in the figures and tables), six classes were distinguished (Table 2): 0% of dolomite (code 1), less than 10% of dolomite (code 2), dolomite in the range of 10 to 25% (code 3), dolomite between 25 and 50% (code 4), dolomite in the range of 50 to 75% (code 5), and dolomite between 75 and 100% (code 6). For geostatistical modeling purposes these initial six classes were later grouped into three broader classes: undolomitized lithologies (named D1) with dolomite in the range of 0 to 10% (including codes 1 and 2); partially dolomitized lithologies (named D2) with dolomite in the range of 10 to 75% (including codes 3, 4, and 5); and fully dolomitized lithologies (named D3) with dolomite in the range of 75 to 100% (including code 6).

The abundance of pores (referred to as “Pore Abundance” in the figures and tables) was coded as follows (Table 2): absent pores (code 1), rare pores (code 2), rare to common pores (code 3), bimodal rare and abundant pores (code 4), common pores (code 5), common to abundant pores (code 6), and abundant pores (code 7). Code 4 (rarely observed) refers to samples that contain two different types of porosity (e.g., moldic and intercrystalline or moldic and vuggy), being, respectively, rare and abundant. For geostatistical purposes, these seven initial classes were later grouped into five broader classes by merging together classes 3 and 4 and classes 5 and 6.

In the following histograms, representing the results of the statistical treatment, the values reported as “????” correspond to undefined, but not null, values in the log data set. This is because at the same well depth information is not available for all properties. These values were not taken into account when computing statistics (mean, standard deviation, etc.).
In terms of dolomite abundance ("Dolo Quantity"), the analysis on the complete succession, including the three platform stages, shows that 44% of the total rock volume is fully dolomitized (75–100% of dolomite; D3), 45% is not dolomitized or poorly dolomitized (<10% of dolomite; D1), and 11% is partially dolomitized (10–75% of dolomite; D2).

In terms of pore abundance ("Pore Abundance") in the whole succession, 60% of the total rock volume displays pores falling in the “absent” and “rare” classes (codes 1 and 2) and 22% is given by pores in the “rare to common” and “common” classes (codes 3 and 5), whereas only 17% of the rock volume displays pores in the “common to abundant” and “abundant” classes (codes 6 and 7). Class 4 is poorly represented in the succession.

With regard to the relative abundance of depositional environments ("Environment") in the whole succession, the IR is the best represented, although some differences are highlighted when observing the facies distribution for each of the three platform stages individually (Fig. 11). Moreover, the distribution of depositional environments through the different stages of the platform is also reflected in different proportions of dolomitization and associated macroscopic pores. Indeed, in Stage 1 (Fig. 11A), which is dominated by T (code 2) and OP (code 1) environments, the fully dolomitized rock volume (code 6) represents less than 10%, and the pores are dominantly (>70%) absent. In Stage 2 (Fig. 11B), the dominant environment is the IR (code 3), with appearance of minor S (code 5). This is the most dolomitized of the three stages, in which the fully

Fig. 11.—Frequency distribution of the “Environment,” “Dolo Quantity,” and “Pore Abundance” for the three stages of platform evolution. A) Stage 1 (89 samples). B) Stage 2 (190 samples). C) Stage 3 (159 samples). See Table 2 for the code explanation.
Dolomitized rock volume (code 6) accounts for 60% of the total. Here the pore abundance shows a more complex distribution: “absent” and “rare” classes (codes 1 and 2) account for about 38%, “rare to common” and “common” classes (codes 3 and 5) account for 26%, whereas “common to abundant” and “abundant” classes (codes 6 and 7) account for about 20%. Finally, in Stage 3 (Fig. 11C), the most represented environments are IR (code 3) and IO (code 4), with 38% of the total rock volume fully dolomitized (code 6). The pore abundance is distributed as follows: “absent” and “rare” classes (codes 1 and 2) account for about 48% and “rare to common” and “common” classes (codes 3 and 5) account for about 15%, whereas “common to abundant” and “abundant” classes (codes 6 and 7) account for less than 15%.

The statistical analysis was also performed to evaluate the abundance of dolomite (“Dolo Quantity”) and type of facies (“Facies Groups”) in each depositional environment (Figs. 12, 13).

It turns out that in the OP environment only 11% of the rock volume is fully dolomitized (Fig. 12A). Here the dominant facies groups are the muddy and fine grained ones (codes 1 and 2), with locally high proportions of marlstone.

The T environment contains 13% of fully dolomitized rocks (Fig. 12B). The most common facies groups are the muddy and the fine...
grained types (codes 1 and 2). Deposits from this environment only occur during Stage 1 of platform evolution (Fig. 10).

The IR boasts with more than 50% of the rock volume being fully dolomitized and around 22% being undolomitized (Fig. 12C). This environment is mainly composed of rudist-rich (or bearing) facies and muddy facies (codes 4 and 1).

The IO lithologies are dominantly (47%) fully dolomitized, whereas 42% are not dolomitized (Fig. 13A). This environment consists mainly of fine and medium-coarse grained facies (codes 2 and 3), followed by muddy facies (code 1).

Finally, lithologies deposited in the S environment, which represent only a limited rock volume, are always (100%) fully dolomitized and are given only by fine and medium-coarse grained facies (Fig. 13B). Deposits from this environment only occur during Stage 2 of the platform evolution (Fig. 10).

The abundance of pores ("Pore Abundance") is directly proportional to the degree of dolomitization ("Dolo Quantity") in the succession. Indeed, pores mainly fall into the classes "absent" and "rare" (codes 1 and 2) in the undolomitized succession (where dolomite is absent or less than 10%) corresponding to D1 (Fig. 14A). In the partially dolomitized succession (where dolomite is in the range of 10–75%), corresponding to D2 (Fig. 14B), pores of the “absent” and “rare” classes (codes 1 and 2) are still dominant, although pores in the “rare to common” and “common” classes (codes 3 and 5) also become important, with only minor pores in the “common to abundant” and “abundant” classes (codes 6 and 7). Finally, in the fully dolomitized lithologies (where dolomite is between 75 and 100%), corresponding to D3 (Fig. 14C), pores are dominantly falling into the “common to abundant” and “abundant” classes (codes 6 and 7) and secondarily into the “rare” class (code 2).

Interdependence also exists between degree of dolomitization ("Dolo Quantity") and pore abundance ("Pore Abundance") within the different types of facies ("Facies Groups"). In particular, muddy and fine grained facies (codes 1 and 2) are mainly undolomitized and are dominated by pores falling into the classes "absent" to "rare" (codes 1 and 2; Fig. 15A). On the other hand, medium-coarse grained facies and rudist-rich (or bearing) facies (codes 3 and 4) are mainly fully dolomitized and are characterized by more abundant pores (codes 5, 6, and 7; Fig. 15B).

The main conclusions deduced from the statistical data treatment are that:

1. Dolomitization is preferentially concentrated in Stage 2 of the platform evolution, where 60% of the succession is dolomitized (Fig. 11B);
2. The most dolomitized environments correspond to the IR and the S environments, followed in importance by the IO environment (Figs. 12, 13);
3. Rudist-rich (or bearing) facies, corresponding to textures ranging from floatstone to rudstone to boundstone, are more commonly dolomitized (Fig. 15); and
4. Macroscopic porosity shows a direct proportionality with the degree of dolomitization and seems to be facies controlled: pores are more abundant in fully dolomitized portions of the succession.

Fig. 13.—Frequency distribution of the “Facies Groups,” “Dolo Quantity,” and “Pore Abundance” by highlighting (in black color) samples falling in specific depositional environments. A) Inner open platform (IO, 77 samples); B) Shoal (S, 7 samples). See Table 2 for the code explanation.
For the following modeling purposes, several association rules have been obtained from statistical analysis in order to summarize quantitative information that allow us to associate to each depositional environment, in each of the three platform stages, different proportions of dolomitization and related pore abundance. Tables of association rules were constructed (Table 3).

The left part of Table 3 shows the quantitative relationship (in percentages) between the depositional environments (OP, T, IR, IO, and S) and the degree of dolomitization (D1, D2, and D3) for each stage of the platform evolution (Stages 1, 2, and 3). For instance, rocks from the OP in Stage 3 of the succession are fully dolomitized (D3), partially dolomitized (D2), and undolomitized (D1) in the respective amounts of 33%, 22%, and 45%.

The right part of Table 3 illustrates the distribution of the five pore abundance classes \( \Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3, \Phi_4, \Phi_5, \) and \( \Phi_7 \) in each “Environment–Dolo Quantity” couple previously established (see left part of Table 3), for each stage of the platform (Stages 1, 2, and 3). For instance, rocks from the OP of Stage 3 will always display (100%) absence of pores (\( \Phi_1 \)) when they are undolomitized (D1) or partially dolomitized (D2). On the contrary, when these rocks are fully dolomitized (D3), 33.3% of them will be characterized by absent pores (\( \Phi_1 \)), 33.3% by rare pores (\( \Phi_2 \)), and 33.3% by rare to common pores (\( \Phi_3, \Phi_4 \)).

The overall information from statistical analysis was used to establish the methodology for the geostatistical simulations (nested properties) and to obtain quantitative parameters (proportions and probabilities) with which to run the algorithms.

**RESULTS OF GEOSTATISTICAL MODELING**

The final objective of the geostatistical modeling is to populate a 3D grid representing the studied geological reservoir with petrophysical properties (porosities in this study), the values for which vary spatially. Prediction of the distribution of depositional facies and/or facies associations is based on hard data (wells, seismic), but also takes into account the conceptual geological model (paleoenvironmental maps, structural heterogeneities, stratigraphy, etc.). The subsurface geologist can also infer some sedimentological information from outcrop analogs (e.g., Koehrer et al. 2010). This is not the case for the petrophysical properties, which can be altered by diagenesis after deposition and for which distribution may be more difficult to predict. In the present study, the focus has been placed on the characterization, quantification, and simulation of dolomitization and pore abundance distribution. Facies, environments, dolomite abundance, etc., are only known at the sections and cores. Geostatistical methods are used to fill the space between the hard data, using parameters computed from these data (distributions laws, quantitative relationships between properties) via the statistical analysis previously described.

**Data and Grid**

The first step of the modeling approach was to build a geological grid, which represents the studied platform succession in terms of geometry and stratigraphy. Five stratigraphic units corresponding to the three evolutionary stages of the platform development and two subunits have been created to account for some differences in terms of depositional environments within Stages 1 and 2, resulting in a total of five units. The entire block size is 3200 m (X) by 4300 m (Y) by 196 m (Z), and the horizontal cell size is 50 by 50 m.

The layering of the units has been defined to represent the depositional model, and a proportional layering was chosen for all units to account for the syn-tectonic deposition of the sediments (Fig. 2).

The six wells (four field sections and two cores) have been imported into the grid with their three property logs (depositional environments defined by facies, dolomite quantity, and pore abundance) and resampled on the grid cells crossed by their trajectories (assignment of the property with the highest proportion...
in each cell, computed from data within the cells). Figure 16 displays
the global vertical stacking of the five units painted with the
proportions of depositional environment in each layer computed
from the six wells (vertical proportion curve).

**Plurigaussian Simulation Method and Parameters**

In the proposed workflows (double-nested and bi-PGS), the
geostatistical simulations of the property distribution (depositional
facies, degree of dolomitization, pore abundance, etc.) on the
geological grid were done using the nonstationary PGS method (Galli
et al. 1994). This method allows one to take into account the lateral
and vertical changes of facies, dealing with complex spatial
relationships between “lithotypes,” as well as to include constraints
from geological information (Doligez et al. 2003, 2015; Lerat et al.
2007; Barbier et al. 2011; Hamon et al. 2015).

The main geostatistical parameters for this method are the Vertical
Proportion Curves (VPC), the Matrix of Proportions (VPC Matrix),
the variogram models, and the lithotype rules (similar to a facies
substitution diagram; Homewood et al. 1992). The VPC represents
the relative distribution of facies in the main vertical facies succession
of the geological unit (Doligez et al. 1999, Ravenne et al. 2002),
computed from the well facies and related to a reference paleo-
horizontal surface. It also corresponds to the evolution of the
proportions of each lithofacies as a function of the depth (Fig. 17),
which are quantitative data needed in the PGS algorithm. In most
practical cases a 3D grid of proportions is needed instead of average
values at each depth to account for geological lateral changes in facies
distribution. This matrix of proportions consists of a 2D grid
representing a partitioning of the studied reservoir (Fig. 17), each
cell being associated with a local VPC of the sedimentary facies
(Armstrong et al. 2011).

In this study, the matrices of proportion were built with the
delimitation of areas assigned by VPC and geological paleoenviron-
mental maps defined from the geological data. An example of a
depositional environmental map is shown in Figure 17, in which IO platform
and IR platform environments are shown. The PGS simulation process
consists of generating Gaussian Random Functions (GRF) using
defined variogram models. The algorithm then computes in each cell
of the grid truncation values of the GRF from the local proportions
given by the 3D matrix of proportions to partition the field of
Gaussian values and to assign a facies in each cell.

**Workflow1: Double-Nested Simulations**

The main steps of this workflow (presented in Fig. 6) were followed
for the different units. The simulation hypotheses, parameters, and

---

**Fig. 15.—Frequency distribution of the “Facies Groups,” “Dolo Quantity,” and “Pore Abundance” by highlighting (in black color) samples from specific “Facies Groups.” A) Muddy facies (code 1, 179 samples) and fine grained facies (code 2, 104 samples); B) Medium-coarse grained facies (code 3, 33 samples) and rudist-rich (or bearing) facies (code 4, 97 samples). See Table 2 for the code explanation.**
Table 3.—Tables of association rules between depositional environments (OP, T, IR, IO, S), degree of dolomitization (D1, D2, D3) and macroscopic pore abundance classes ($\Phi_1$, $\Phi_2$, $\Phi_{3,4}$, $\Phi_{5,6}$, $\Phi_7$) for the three stages of platform evolution (Stage 1, 2, 3). Left: Quantitative relationship between the depositional environments and the degree of dolomitization (“Environment–Dolo Quantity”). Right: Quantitative relationship between “Pore Abundance” in each of the “Environment–Dolo Quantity” couples established.

![Table 3](image)

Step 1: Simulation of the Distribution of Depositional Environments (“Environment”): The five depositional environments (OP, T, IO, IR, and S) have been taken into account. For each modeled unit and subunit the matrix of proportions (Fig. 17) was built based on the six VPCs of the six wells (Nieves T, Nieves B, Santa Eulalia, Duña, SC6Bis, and SC1) interpolated level by level with a kriging method and using a partition of the studied area from five paleoenvironmental maps.

Figure 18 displays one layer and one cross section in the 3D model resulting from PGS simulations of the depositional environments using two Gaussian variogram models with range values between 350 and 450 m along X direction, 500 to 700 m along Y direction, and 3 m along the vertical (Z) direction (values inferred from the continuity of the geological bodies on outcrop). Inner platform environments dominate this unit. The IR environment is located in the southwestern part of the unit, including the Duña and SC6Bis wells. The rest of the unit consists of the IO environment.

Step 2: Simulation of the Distribution of “Dolo Quantity” within “Environment”: As anticipated in the “Statistical Analysis” section, the six initial classes of dolomite abundance have been merged into three classes from the six wells (D1, D2, and D3; Table 2). The dolomite abundance (“Dolo Quantity”) property has been simulated from three PGSs nested in the three depositional environments (“Environment”) occurring in this unit. The “Dolo Quantity” simulation parameters (proportions from Table 3, variograms, truncation rules) are specific for each depositional environment. Figure 19 displays a layer map (for level 41) and a cross section in the 3D grid after one nested simulation of the two parameters (dolomite abundance and depositional environments) performed for Unit 3. In this unit, the three represented environments are affected by the dolomitization process with close proportions (Table 3), which is what the simulation reproduced.

Step 3: Simulation of the Distribution of “Pore Abundance” Related to the Combination of “Environment–Dolo Quantity” Couples: As anticipated in the “Statistical Analysis” section, the seven initial classes of pore abundance have been merged into five classes from the six wells ($\Phi_1$, $\Phi_2$, $\Phi_{3,4}$, $\Phi_{5,6}$, and $\Phi_7$; see Table 2). The results obtained from the statistical analysis (Table 3) have then been used to fix the parameters (proportions and variograms) for the simulations of the distribution of the five “Pore Abundance” classes...
Table 3) within each “Environment–Dolo Quantity” couple. The presented results come from a second nested approach of PGS simulation of the pore classes within the mixed property. Figure 20 displays the final grid (stacking of the five units) informed with the three properties from Workflow1 (double-nested).

Workflow2: Bi-PGS-nested Simulations

The main steps of the bi-PGS workflow (presented in Fig. 7) were followed for the different units. The simulation hypotheses, parameters, and results of the 3D modeling of properties are presented here for Unit 3.

**Step 1: Computation of the Matrix of Proportions of “Dolo Quantity” from the Matrix of “Environment”**: In this workflow, the link between the two PGSs is given through the proportions of all the associations of one “Environment” with “Dolo Quantity” properties. This is done through the computation of the matrix of proportions of dolomite abundance from the matrix of proportions of depositional environments, using in this case the data from statistical analysis. The resulting grids of proportions are displayed in Figure 21.

**Step 2: Bi-PGS Simulations of “Dolo Quantity” and “Environment”**: Each physical property (“Environment” and “Dolo Quantity”) simulation is associated with a complete PGS, possibly using two underlying Gaussian random functions with their own variogram model, its specific truncation rule (Fig. 7), and its matrix of proportions (Fig. 21). The double nonstationary PGS simulations are processed together.

**Step 3: Simulation of the Distribution of “Pore Abundance” Related to the Combination of “Environment–Dolo Quantity” Couples**: At last, the simulations of the distribution of the five “Pore Abundance” classes ($\Phi_1$, $\Phi_2$, $\Phi_3$, $\Phi_4$, and $\Phi_5$) within each “Environment–Dolo Quantity” couple have been performed using a nested approach. Figure 22 displays the final grid (stacking of the five units) informed with the three properties from Workflow2 (bi-PGS-nested).

**DISCUSSION**

This project was designed as an integrated study of a carbonate reservoir field analogue affected by widespread burial dolomitization that, according to macroscopic observations, enhanced reservoir properties of the precursor carbonates. A data set was produced from characterization of depositional facies and environments, quantification of dolomitization and pore abundance, and their statistical treatment. This multidisciplinary data set provided the basis for the
development of a quantitative reservoir study and 3D geostatistical modeling by applying different workflows.

Controls on Dolomitization and Reservoir Properties

The aim of the sedimentological, diagenetic and statistical analysis accomplished during this survey was to test at reservoir scale some hypotheses related to the controls of burial dolomitization, issued from previous conceptual studies at basin scale (López-Cilla 2009; López-Cilla et al. 2009, 2013, 2016). According to these authors, the dolomitizing fluids were channeled by regional faults through the carbonate succession during burial, and the type of precursor carbonate facies encountered by the fluids further controlled the distribution of dolomitization and the associated macroporosity. In

Fig. 18.—Layer map (level 41) and cross section in the 3D grid after plurigaussian simulation of one parameter (“Environment”), performed for Unit 3.

Fig. 19.—Layer map (level 41) and cross section in the 3D grid after nested simulations of the “Dolo Quantity” parameter within each “Environment,” honoring the proportions defined by the statistical data analysis, performed for Unit 3.
particular, they suggested that dolomitization is more abundant in facies from the proximal depositional environments and that porosity is better developed in rudist- and coral-rich facies. These authors suggested a possible role played by aragonitic bioclasts, which could have been selectively affected by the early meteoric diagenesis experienced by the platform carbonates during periods of relative sea-level fall and platform subaerial exposure. Such early meteoric modification undergone by specific aragonitic shells would have controlled the development of the porosity during burial dolomitization (López-Cilla 2009; López-Cilla et al. 2009, 2013, 2016).

According to the characterization data set produced during this survey, the dolomitization is preferentially concentrated in the regressive part of the first depositional sequence of the Reocín Fm. (T–R Sequence 1) and the earliest stage of transgression of the second depositional sequence (T–R Sequence 2) corresponding with the second stage of the platform evolution (Fig. 11). It seems to be controlled by the facies associations (corresponding to paleoenvironments) and the original depositional textures: the most dolomitized facies are encountered in the inner-restricted platform with marginal shoals, followed by the inner open platform (Figs. 12, 13). Facies from these shallower and more proximal depositional environments were indeed more exposed to early meteoric diagenesis.

At basin scale, the pore abundance of the Reocín Fm. carbonates is variable and was reported to be higher in the dolomitic bodies than in the precursor limestone facies, which are predominantly tight and only rarely exhibit open voids (López-Cilla 2009, Blázquez-Fernández 2013). At reservoir scale, the dolomite bodies studied during this survey exhibit a wide range of macroscopic pore abundance, with pore types classified as intercrystalline, moldic, and vuggy. Macroscopic voids have sizes that range from submillimetric up to several centimeters (Fig. 8). The visual evaluation of the macroscopic pores allowed the definition of seven pore abundance classes (grouped in five classes in the geostatistical modeling), from absent to abundant (Table 2). Statistical analysis indicated that, in a general way, total macroscopic porosity is directly proportional to the degree of dolomitization (Fig. 14). Further relationships were observed between different carbonate textures (facies groups) and the abundance of macroscopic pores (Fig. 15), with the rudist-rich facies (dolo-floatstone and dolorudstone) and the sand shoals (dolo-grainstone and dolo-packstone) showing the highest pore occurrence. Abundant aragonitic shells (rudists, corals), easily leached or recrystallized during early diagenesis, could justify the higher moldic porosity in these facies.

Fig. 20.—Final grid (stacking of the five units) informed with the three properties (“Environment,” “Dolo Quantity,” and “Pore Abundance”) from the double-nested workflow for the complete succession.

Fig. 21.—Computation of the matrix of proportions of “Dolo Quantity” from the matrix of “Environment.”
At the present stage it is not possible to say which modification the early diagenesis really caused (preferential dissolution or recrystallization of the aragonitic shell portions only?) in these facies to facilitate the development of porosity during burial dolomitization. However, this hypothesis deserves to be further investigated, since subsurface reservoirs in Urgonian-type platforms elsewhere could display similar porosity patterns. Future perspectives for this survey would therefore include applying and possibly validating the formulated hypothesis on a subsurface reservoir case study, in which detailed petrophysical measurements could also be accomplished.

3D Modeling

In carbonate reservoirs, heterogeneity is usually driven by the interplay of both depositional environments and diagenetic patterns (i.e., Morrow and MacIreland 1990, Moore 2001, Ali et al. 2010). In this survey, characterization data from the sedimentology and diagenesis study (facies, environments, dolomitization, pore abundance) were translated into quantitative parameters and rules to distribute simultaneously the different classes of properties (“Environment,” “Dolo Quantity,” “Pore Abundance”) in the numerical models.

In particular, this study proposed an innovative strategy, allowing us to integrate conceptual sedimentological models through the use of paleoenvironmental maps in the computation of depositional environment (“Environment”) probability distribution. Moreover, a realistic 3D sedimentary model and associated diagenetic overprints have been generated through simulation of the distribution of only one diagenetic modification (e.g., the massive dolomitization “Dolo Quantity”), which mainly controls porosity enhancement (López-Cilla et al. 2016). Finally, petrophysical property distribution (e.g., the macroporosity “Pore Abundance”) has been constrained and simulated with the combination of the double property given by the “Environment–Dolo Quantity” couples.

The two alternative workflows used (double-nested and bi-PGS) allowed us to simulate the distribution of properties by taking into account different parameters. Both methods illustrate the distribution of dolomitization and pore abundance as a function of the distribution of the precursor depositional facies, which in turn are linked to the evolution of the depositional environments and relative sea-level changes.

The presented 3D reservoir models account for the thickening toward the north (cores area) and thinning toward the south (outcrops area) of the dolomitized succession. This kind of dolomitization “gradient” from north to south (Figs. 20, 22) fits with evidence for dolomite body mapping and with the proximity of the cores area to the major regional Bustriguado–Peña Castillo fault system (Fig. 2), which could have controlled the initial flush of the dolomitizing fluids through the carbonate succession.

The overall results of the workflows used are the distribution of the property “Pore Abundance” (Φ) controlled by the “Dolo Quantity” and by the “Environment” (Figs. 20, 22). The final models show that Φ1 (absent pores) is the main class of porosity in the whole reservoir. Unit 1 is dominantly represented by Φ1. Unit 2 is mainly represented by Φ3,4 (rare to common pores), with intercalations of other Φ classes. Unit 3 is represented by Φ1 in the southeastern part of the study area and by Φ3,6 (common to abundant pores) and Φ6 (abundant pores) in the remaining areas. The models also reproduce the higher pore abundance to the north and in the stratigraphic central part of the geological model, which also correspond with the most dolomitized platform areas.

The two workflows used lead to very similar results, which is to be expected, as the input data are the same for both approaches and as the same parameters (grids of proportions, variograms, truncation rules, etc.) were used for the geostatistical simulations. However, each workflow has its benefits and drawbacks and could be more appropriate than the other, depending on the geological data available and the objectives of the survey. When using a double-nested approach a high number of variables is requested, which can be laborious for practical use. A first set of parameters for the first PGS of the first property (here depositional environment) is needed. Then a second set of parameters for the second property distribution has to be defined for each class of depositional environment. On the other hand, it offers significant flexibility linked to these possible choices of parameters for the simulations. The bi-PGS workflow allows one to work with heterotropic data (when the second property is not present in each sample for which the first property is known), and it also allows one to maintain the continuity of each variable, though the definition of the relationships between the parameters to co-simulate is the most critical step of this approach. The main purpose of the study was to focus on workflows and methods by which to integrate quantitatively the diagenetic overprint in the sedimentary model. In a subsurface field case modeling study, multiple realizations and sensitivity analyses to uncertain parameters should have been carried out.

Both modeling approaches presented in this contribution require a preliminary step of characterization of prime importance. Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of relevant data to define sedimentary facies, diagenesis, and petrophysical properties should be planned to identify and quantify their distributions and dominant relationships. Keeping in mind the opportunity to use advanced methods, such as nested or bi-PGS, should dictate the characterization workflow since the beginning of the study in order to improve the predictability of the model.

FIG. 22.—Final grid (stacking of the five units) informed with the three properties (“Environment,” “Dolo Quantity,” and “Pore Abundance”) from the bi-PGS-nested workflow for the complete succession.
CONCLUSIONS

This study contributes to the need to develop modeling approaches that take into account the interplay between depositional-sedimentary features and subsequent diagenetic modifications in order to better and more realistically distribute the heterogeneities in carbonate reservoirs. It focused on a field analogue, which consists of an Early Cretaceous shallow-water carbonate platform in the Basque-Cantabrian basin, where widespread burial dolomitization took place. The workflow used (Fig. 1) includes field and subsurface data acquisition and interpretation, statistical characterization of sedimentary and diagenetic parameters, and geostatistical modeling using bi-PGS and nested simulations. The whole data set allows us to draw the following conclusions:

- Eighteen carbonate lithofacies were distinguished and grouped into four groups: muddy, fine grained, medium-coarse grained, and rudist-rich (or bearing) facies. They were associated with five depositional environments: inner restricted platform, inner open platform, shoal, transitional inner–outer platform, and outer platform.
- The succession was organized into two depositional transgressive–regressive (T–R) sequences. Three successive stages of platform evolution were distinguished, which are characterized by a different distribution of facies and depositional environments.
- An innovative methodology of diagenesis characterization and quantification has been tested to investigate main controls on the distribution of dolomitization and the effects on macroporosity.
- Massive burial dolomitization increases toward the middle of the studied succession, corresponding to the phase of regression of the first depositional sequence and the earliest phase of transition of the second depositional sequence (second stage of the platform evolution).
- The dolomitization is controlled by the palaeoenvironments and the original depositional facies: the most dolomitized are the inner-restricted platform with marginal shoals, followed by the inner open platform. Within these palaeoenvironments, the most dolomitized lithofacies are rudist-rich floatstone, rudstone, and boundstone and sand shoals grainstone.
- Pores are most abundant in fully dolomitized portions of the succession and particularly in the medium-coarse grained and rudist-rich (or bearing) lithofacies. Abundant aragonitic shells, easily leached or recrystallized during early diagenesis, could justify the preferential development of porosity in these facies during later dolomitization.
- Two different geostatistical modeling workflows were developed using bi-PGS and nested approaches to simulate the interdependence between original depositional facies, degree of dolomitization (i.e., amount of dolomite), and pore abundance.
- The two simulation workflows lead to similar results. These methods required advanced quantitative characterization of the different classes of properties but also offer a high level of flexibility and possibilities of constraints for the simulations.
- Each workflow could be more appropriate than another depending on the geological data available and the aim of the survey.
- Future perspectives should include the application of these workflows to subsurface reservoirs, for which detailed petrophysical and production data are available, in order to evaluate to what extent the quality of reservoir modeling is affected by integrating (or not) the effects of diagenesis.
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