

From PZ summation to wavefield separation, mirror imaging and up-down deconvolution: the evolution of ocean-bottom seismic data processing

Sergio Grion, CGGVeritas

Summary

This paper discusses present trends in ocean-bottom seismic (OBS) data processing. Current practices for industrial P-wave processing are described, discussed and exemplified using synthetic and real data examples. The discussion highlights the evolution of processing techniques from inception to present time. Initially, specialized OBS processing aimed at the attenuation of water layer reverberations only. Later on, processing progressed towards a more complete wavefield separation approach and new applications emerged, such as more sophisticated *P* (pressure) and *Z* (vertical component) calibration, up-down deconvolution, and mirror imaging. The transition of these applications to standard practice is still ongoing but progressing rapidly, backed by theoretical correctness and the quality of practical results on field data.

Introduction

Ocean-bottom seismic data acquisitions routinely employ hydrophones and three component (3-C) geophones or accelerometers embedded in an ocean bottom cable (OBC) or in individual ocean bottom nodes (OBN). The resultant recording of the pressure and particle motion components of the full elastic wavefield expands the scope of marine seismic data analysis and interpretation beyond conventional streamer data applications. There are two main categories of multi-component data processing applications: converted-wave processing and enhanced processing of pressure waves. This paper focuses on the latter, and more in particular on its evolution from the 1990s to the present time.

When pressure P and vertical particle velocity Z are simultaneously recorded, the elastic wavefield can be separated into its up and down-going parts. In the 1990s, processing efforts usually ignored the down-going wavefield and focused on up-going waves only. Depending on the separation level, upward-traveling waves are free of receiver-side multiples and facilitate further processing and conventional imaging. However down-going waves have important applications. Mirror imaging of down-going waves offer wider subsurface coverage than conventional migration of up-going waves. Additionally, up-down deconvolution combines both wavefields to completely remove free-surface effects. Figure 1 illustrates the current state-of-the-art choice of processing options which exploit the separation of up- and down-going waves. The choice of separation level, just below or just above the seabottom, is explained in the next section.




Figure 1 Wavefield separation just below the sea bottom attenuates receiver side multiples, but additional processing is required to attenuate source-side multiples. Alternatively, after separation just above, the up-down deconvolution process removes all multiples. Mirror imaging of the down-going wavefield provides better illumination in case of sparse receivers. Only the receiver ghost is imaged, therefore 2nd and higher order multiples have to be attenuated.

Wavefield separation

Throughout the 1980s and most of the 1990s, wavefield separation for industrial purposes was aimed at multiple removal only. As such, only the up-going wavefield was calculated, and the wavefield separation process was usually referred to as “PZ summation” (See for example Barr and Sanders, 1989). This term makes explicit reference to the calculation of the up-going wavefield as a sum, after appropriate weighting, of the P and Z components but does not account for the calculation of the equally important down-going wavefield, which can be obtained as a weighted difference of P and Z .

During the 1990s wavefield separation became more precisely formalized and more advanced PZ calibration methods were developed. (Amundsen, 1993; Soubaras, 1996; Schalkwijk et al., 1999; Osen et al., 1999). Wavefield separation can be thought of as occurring either infinitesimally below or infinitesimally above the seafloor. In Figure 2 there are two contributions to U_{above} , one from the earth (right side) and one from the seabed bounce




Figure 2 Up-going and down-going events just above and just below the seabed. The left part of the diagram considers an event arriving at the seabottom receiver from above, such as for example the direct arrival, or a water-layer multiple. Such event is purely down-going just-below the seabottom, but just above the seabottom it incurs reflection and is therefore simultaneously up-going and down-going. Similarly, the right part of the diagram considers an event arriving from below, such as a primary event, source-side multiple or internal multiple. Such event is purely up-going just above, but is both up- and down-going just below.

(left side). However, wavefield separation at a location just below the seabed, estimates U_{below} , which does not contain the seabed bounce.

Up-down deconvolution

Once the recorded wavefield is separated into its up-going and down-going parts, up-down deconvolution can be used to attenuate all free-surface multiples and simultaneously designate the data. Moreover, the overall water-layer effect is attenuated, with important implications for 4D processing (Wang et al., 2010b). The theory of using up-down deconvolution to address surface-related water-column multiples in a horizontally-layered medium is well known (see, for example, Sonneland and Berg, 1987). Amundsen (2001) discusses the method in detail and extends the method to more complex geology. This simple deconvolution approach implicitly assumes a 1-D earth (i.e. a horizontally-layered medium). On the other hand, practical experience has repeatedly proven that the method is robust in the presence of structure. Wang et al. (2010) have recently investigated the reasons for this success under violation of the assumptions.

As an example, consider the finite-difference synthetic dataset presented in Wang et al. 2010. It consists of 170 OBS nodes at depths between 1375 and 1837m, and 1,280 shots. Shot and receiver sampling is 12.5m and 100m, respectively. The sea bottom is gently dipping, with an average dip of 1.6 degrees, but significant subsurface structure is present. Up- and down-going waves just above seabed are shown in Figure 3c and 3d. After wavefield separation the next step is to deconvolve the down-going waves from the up-going waves for each receiver. The up-down deconvolution result clearly shows that all free-surface multiples are successfully and completely removed (Figure 3e). For comparison purposes process the data is also processed using a conventional PZ summation approach (Figure 4).

Mirror imaging

The down-going wavefield just-above the seabottom does not contain any primary reflected energy. However, down-going receiver ghosts bounce from the same reflectors as the primary




Figure 3 A hydrophone (P) and calibrated vertical component of particle velocity (Z) common receiver gather is shown in a) and b). Events M1 and M2 are the first and second order water-layer multiples. The up-going and down-going wavefields just above the sea bottom are shown in c) and d). Notice that the up-going wavefield contains both primaries and multiples, while the down-going contains only multiples. The up-down deconvolution result is in e). The down-going wavefield acts as a successful multi-dimensional deconvolution operator for the up-going.




Figure 4 Depth migrated stacked sections for the vertical component a), hydrophone b), a conventional PZ summation approach c), and up-down deconvolution d). The arrows point to multiple events and the circle highlight an area where multiple energy tends to focus, creating undesired artifacts. For illustration purposes no demultiple is applied to the data in a) and b). The PZ summation image in c) is obtained by migration of the up-going wavefiled just below the seabottom, with no additional source-side demultiple applied.

waves. In fact, the sea surface acts as a mirror reflecting the image of subsurface structure and receiver ghosts can be used for “mirror imaging” (Grion et al., 2007). This imaging approach is appropriate for either node surveys or cable surveys with significant cable separation. In either case, the acquisition geometry is in general characterized by a sparse and localized receiver spread in conjunction with a wider and denser shot grid. With such geometry, down-going waves provide better subsurface illumination than up-going waves, especially for shallow events. In other words, mirror imaging allows a shift in acquisition effort from the receiver side to the shot side. This is an important factor for ocean-bottom operations, where receiver deployment is significantly more costly and time consuming than operating air guns at the sea surface.

Mirror imaging is not restricted to a particular imaging algorithm, it can be used in a basic NMO and stack process for rapid quality control of noise levels and clock drifts of autonomous OBS nodes. It can also be used for migration using any algorithm. The extended illumination that the method allows is exemplified in figure 5. Mirror imaging of this data is thoroughly discussed in Dash et al., 2009.

In current practice mirror imaging uses not the entire down-going wavefield but the 1st order multiple only, sometimes also referred as the receiver ghost. Therefore, after wavefield separation, 2nd and higher order multiples have to be attenuated from the down-going wavefield. Conventional demultiple algorithms can be used for this purpose. However in complex scenarios the model-based SRME approach discussed in Pica et al. (2006) can give significant advantages and is generally preferred.




Figure 5 Seven OBS were successfully deployed on the ocean bottom at an average depth of about 1300 m with variable inline separation (100-300m). The data was acquired over the Northern Cascadia continental margin offshore Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada. The OBS line was 1 km long while the shot line was 15 km long. With mirror imaging, illumination is mostly determined by the extent of the shot line and is therefore much wider than for conventional imaging. With conventional imaging illumination is mostly determined by the extent of the receiver line.

Conclusions

PZ summation is aimed at the attenuation of receiver side multiples and is widely used in the industry. It consists of calculating the up-going wavefield just below the seabottom. Recently, a number of applications for the down-going wavefield have also emerged, and the processing of ocean-bottom data has shifted towards a more complete wavefield separation approach. After wavefield separation, up-down deconvolution is an effective and automatic free-surface demultiple and designature method, with important implications for 4D data processing. Additionally, mirror imaging of down-going waves allows for increased illumination of the subsurface and is rapidly becoming standard for OBS acquisitions.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Chevron for generation of the synthetic data used in this paper and for permission to publish the results. The Cascadia data is courtesy of the University of Victoria, BC, Canada, processing was carried out at CCGVeritas. Finally, the author would like to thank Richard Bale, Yi Wang and Shuki Ronen for many interesting discussions and for reviewing this manuscript.

References

- Amundsen, L., 1993, Wavenumber-based filtering of marine point-source data, *Geophysics*, **58**, 1335-1348.
- Amundsen, L., 2001, Elimination of free-surface related multiples without need of a source wavelet, *Geophysics*, **66**, 327-341.
- Barr, F. J. and Sanders, J. I., 1989, Attenuation of water-column reverberations using pressure and velocity detectors in a water-bottom cable: 59th SEG Annual Meeting, 653-655.
- Dash, R., Spence, G., Hyndman, R., Grion, S., Wang, Y., Ronen, S., 2009, Wide-area imaging from OBS multiples, *Geophysics*, **74**, Q41-Q47
- Grion, S., Exley, R., Manin, M., Miao, X., Pica, A., L., Wang, Y., Granger, P., and Ronen, S., Mirror imaging of OBS data, *First Break*, Vol. **25**, No. 11, November 2007.
- Osen, A., Amundsen, L., and Reitan, A., 1999, Removal of water-layer multiples from multicomponent sea-bottom data: *Geophysics*, **64**, 838-851.
- Pica, A., Manin M., Granger P.Y., Marin D., Suaudeau E., David B., Poulain G., and Herrmann P., 3D SRME on OBS data using waveform multiple modeling: 76th SEG Annual Meeting, 2659-2663.
- Sonneland, L. and Berg, L., 1987, Comparison of two approaches to water layer multiple attenuation by wave field extrapolation, 57th Meeting, Society of Exploration Geophysicists, Expanded Abstract, 276-277
- Schalkwijk, K. M., Wapenaar, C. P. A. and Verschuur, D. J., 1999, Application of two-step decomposition to multicomponent ocean-bottom data: Theory and case study: *J. Seism. Expl.*, **8**, 261-278.
- Soubaras, R., 1996, Ocean bottom hydrophone and geophone processing: 66th Meeting, Society of Exploration Geophysicists, Expanded Abstract, 24-27.
- Wang, Y., Grion, S., Bale, R., 2010, Up-down deconvolution in the presence of subsurface structure, 72nd EAGE meeting, Expanded Abstract D001.
- Wang, Y., Bale, R., Grion, S., 2010b, A new approach to remove the water column effect from 4-D ocean bottom data, 80th SEG Annual meeting.