



**University of
Sunderland**

Shafiee, Mahmood, Animah, Issac, Alkali, Babakalli and Baglee, David (2018)
Decision Support Methods and Applications in the Upstream Oil and Gas Sector.
Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering, 173. pp. 1173-1186. ISSN 0920-
4105

Downloaded from: <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/id/eprint/10072/>

Usage guidelines

Please refer to the usage guidelines at <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact sure@sunderland.ac.uk.

Manuscript Number: PETROL12300R1

Title: Decision Support Methods and Applications in the Upstream Oil and Gas Sector

Article Type: Review Article

Keywords: Decision-making; Asset management; Decision support system (DSS); Upstream Oil and gas

Corresponding Author: Dr. Mahmood Shafiee, Ph.D

Corresponding Author's Institution: Cranfield University, Cranfield, Bedfordshire

First Author: Mahmood Shafiee, Ph.D

Order of Authors: Mahmood Shafiee, Ph.D; Isaac Animah, PhD; Babakalli Alkali , PhD; David Baglee, PhD

Abstract: Decision-making support (DMS) methods are widely used for technical, economic, social and environmental assessments within different energy sectors, including upstream oil and gas, refining and distribution, petrochemical, power generation, nuclear power, solar, biofuels, and wind. The main aim of this paper is to present a comprehensive literature review and classification framework for the latest scholarly research on the application of DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas industry. To achieve this aim, a systematic review is conducted on the current state-of-the-art and future perspectives of various DMS methods applied to different upstream operations (such as exploration, development and production) which take place prior to shipping of crude oil and natural gas to the refineries for processing. Journal and conference proceeding sources that contain literature on the subject are identified, and based on a set of inclusion criteria the related papers are selected and reviewed carefully. A framework is then proposed to classify the literature according to the year and source of publications, type of fossil fuel sources, oil and gas field's lifecycle phases, data collection techniques, decision-making methods, and geographical distribution and location of case studies. The proposed literature classification and content analysis can help upstream oil and gas industry stakeholders such as field owners, asset managers, service providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies to gain better insight about their business activities with well-informed decision-making processes.

Decision Support Methods and Applications in the Upstream Oil and Gas Sector

Mahmood Shafiee ^{1*}, Isaac Animah ¹, Babakalli Alkali ², David Baglee ³

¹ School of Energy and Power, Cranfield University, Bedfordshire MK43 0AL, UK

² School of Engineering and Built Environment, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

³ Faculty of Engineering and Advanced Manufacturing, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, UK

* Corresponding author, Tel: +44 1234 750111 ; Email: m.shafiee@cranfield.ac.uk

Abstract

Decision-making support (DMS) methods are widely used for technical, economic, social and environmental assessments within different energy sectors, including upstream oil and gas, refining and distribution, petrochemical, power generation, nuclear power, solar, biofuels, and wind. The main aim of this paper is to present a comprehensive literature review and classification framework for the latest scholarly research on the application of DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas industry. To achieve this aim, a systematic review is conducted on the current state-of-the-art and future perspectives of various DMS methods applied to different upstream operations (such as exploration, development and production) which take place prior to shipping of crude oil and natural gas to the refineries for processing. Journal and conference proceeding sources that contain literature on the subject are identified, and based on a set of inclusion criteria the related papers are selected and reviewed carefully. A framework is then proposed to classify the literature according to the year and source of publications, type of fossil fuel sources, oil and gas field's lifecycle phases, data collection techniques, decision-making methods, and geographical distribution and location of case studies. The proposed literature classification and content analysis can help upstream oil and gas industry stakeholders such as field owners, asset managers, service providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies to gain better insight about their business activities with well-informed decision-making processes.

Keywords

Decision-making; Asset management; Decision support system (DSS); Upstream Oil and gas.

1. Introduction

Despite the unprecedented increase in the use of renewables - wind, solar, biofuels, hydro, waste, geothermal and tidal energy - to support electricity generation in the last decade, many countries still produce significant amount of energy from burning fossil fuels, mainly crude oil, coal, and natural gas. According to a recent report published by the World Energy Council (2017), oil remains the world's leading fuel, accounting for about one-third of global energy consumption, followed by coal and natural gas with around %29 and %24 respectively. The oil and gas industry is divided into three major sectors of upstream, midstream, and downstream. The upstream sector is the most capital-intensive and important segment of the three in the oil and gas business, as this is where crude oil and natural gas are produced. The upstream oil and gas includes all activities related to the exploration and extraction of crude oil and natural gas which take place prior to shipping products to the refineries for processing.

Over the past four decades, the upstream oil and gas industries have applied various ways of well-informed business decision-making to increase production volume, reduce costs, improve safety, enhance operational performance, and protect the environment. Many of the decision-making problems in upstream oil and gas sector are complex in nature, involve uncertainties and risks, and require significant input from practitioners and policy-makers. The concept of decision analysis was first applied in the 1960s to solve oil and gas 'exploration' problems in the upstream sector (Huang *et al.*, 1995). Since then, the concept has been used in decision-making for a number of other important areas such as field development, production, maintenance of wells and facilities, life extension and decommissioning, etc. (Animah and Shafiee, 2018).

In recent years, a spectrum of qualitative and quantitative decision-making support (DMS) methods has been proposed in the literature to assist stakeholders in the upstream oil and gas sector to better understand reservoir characteristics, simulate field operations, develop low carbon production technologies, and make justifiable business decisions regarding exploration and development of both green and brown fields. As stated in Bratvold *et al.* (2009), DMS methods can help practitioners not only in performing technical and diagnostic tests of equipment but also in complying with regulatory and risk management requirements. Typical DMS methods used within the upstream sector include: operational research methods such as linear programming, integer programming, and goal programming; economic analysis methods such as cost-benefit analysis (CBA), real options analysis (ROA), and life cycle costing (LCC); statistical methods such as probabilistic approaches, simulation-based methods, and decision tree analysis (DTA); and environmental assessment methods such as environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA).

Strantzali and Aravossis (2016) indicated that the use of single-criterion approaches have historically dominated decision-making in the upstream oil and gas sector. However, given

1 the complexity and conflicting interests of involved actors in the decision making process, the
2 use of multi-criteria **evaluation** techniques is gaining momentum. Such techniques are able to
3 consider simultaneously multiple attributes **of different decision-making problems in the**
4 **upstream sector (such as selecting the best drilling techniques and vessels, choosing the most**
5 **appropriate maintenance strategies for different systems and components on oil and gas**
6 **platforms, determining the most environmentally friendly end-of-life strategies for wells,**
7 **identifying the most viable decommissioning processes for facilities, etc.).** Moreover, in order
8 to account for uncertainties associated with practitioners' subjective perception and
9 experience in decision-making, **soft computing methods such as fuzzy set theory, rough set**
10 **theory, artificial intelligence (AI), and neural networks (NN) are increasingly becoming**
11 **popular.**

12 Despite the growing use of decision analytics **approaches** in upstream, midstream, and
13 downstream oil and gas sectors in recent years, the literature on classification of the methods
14 employed to support the decision-making processes in these sectors has been **very** limited
15 (**Deore, 2012**). This paper aims to conduct a systematic review on the current state-of-the-art
16 and future perspectives of the application of various DMS methods in the upstream **oil and**
17 **gas** industry. **The** review is based on an exhaustive assessment of the studies identified in
18 relation to the topic, including scholarly articles in refereed academic journals and conference
19 proceedings between the years 1977 and 2016. A framework is also proposed to classify the
20 literature according to the year and source of publication, type of fossil fuel source, oil and
21 gas field development phase, data collection technique, decision-making method, and
22 geographical location of **the** case studies. The findings of this review can be very useful to
23 upstream **oil and gas** industry stakeholders, including field owners, asset managers, service
24 providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies **to gain**
25 **current state-of-the-art knowledge about well-informed decision-making, find out how to**
26 **determine the most effective DMS method for each problem, and to identify real-life**
27 **applications and case studies.**

28 The structure of the paper is organized as follows. In **Section 2**, the most commonly used
29 decision-making support methods in the **oil and gas** industry, **and** in particular the upstream
30 sector, are introduced. The review methodology as well as the classification framework are
31 presented in **Section 3**, and the observation and findings of the classification process are
32 reported in details in **Section 4**. Finally, the concluding remarks and future research directions
33 are given in **Section 5**.

34 **2. Decision-making support (DMS) methods**

35 The most commonly used decision-making support (DMS) methods in the oil and gas
36 industries include **operational research (OR)**, cost-benefit analysis (CBA), **real options**
37 **analysis (ROA)**, life cycle costing (LCC), **environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA)**,

1 Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS), decision tree analysis (DTA), multi-criteria decision analysis
2 (MCDA), fuzzy logic analysis (FLA) and artificial intelligence (AI). In what follows, a brief
3 description of these methods and their application to the upstream sector are presented.
4

5 *2.1 Operational research (OR)*

7 OR models include a model representing the logical and mathematical relationships between
8 variables, an objective function with which alternative solutions are evaluated, and
9 constraints that restrict solutions to feasible values. This mathematical model can be either a
10 linear programming (LP) or a non-linear programming (NLP) problem. In LP, all objectives
11 and constraints are linear functions, however, in NLP, at least one of constraints or the
12 objective function is a non-linear function. The decision variables of an OR model can be
13 continuous, or integer, or a mixture of both. Integer programming (IP) is a model whose all
14 variables are constrained to take integer values, whereas in mixed-integer programming
15 (MIP) only some of the decision variables are required to have integer values.
16

17 Goal programming (GP) is a relatively new OR model that has been proposed as an
18 approach for the analysis of problems involving multiple, conflicting objectives. The basic
19 approach of GP is to specify an aspiration level for each of the objectives and then seek a
20 solution that minimizes the weighted sum of deviations of these objective functions from
21 their respective goals. GP problems, depending on the type of their mathematical model, can
22 be solved by either LP, NLP, IP or MILP.
23

24 *2.2 Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)*

25 CBA concept offers decision-makers the opportunity to evaluate the economic viability of
26 different technologies, projects and policies. A key strength of this approach is that it
27 provides results that are compatible to market mechanisms. CBA evaluation process involves
28 summing up the equivalent money value of present costs of a project or policy and compare
29 the result with the present value of benefits in order to ascertain if the project or policy is
30 worthwhile. A project or policy is considered beneficial if the sum of its benefits becomes
31 greater than the sum of its costs or when the benefit to cost ratio is greater than one.
32

33 *2.3 Real options analysis (ROA)*

34 One of the limitations of the CBA approach is that not all costs or benefits (e.g. cost of
35 human injury/death) of a project or policy can be expressed in monetary equivalents
36 (Hammond, 1966). For this reason, those decision-making outcomes that cannot be easily
37 assigned a monetary value may introduce a level of uncertainty into cost or benefit
38 calculations, hence restricting the applicability of the CBA method. ROA, also termed as real
39 options valuation (ROV), is an extension of CBA approach that can be used for evaluating
40 the value of options associated with a decision under uncertainty. The tool can help
41 stakeholders decide on investments that might be delayed, expanded, abandoned, or
42 repositioned. ROA is useful for the analysis of investment projects in the upstream sector,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 such as the development of oil fields (Jafarizadeh and Bratvold, 2009; Silitonga, 2015). Oil
2 field development projects are an example of multiyear investment that is subject to many
3 uncertainties during the whole lifetime of the project. The ROA approach involves the
4 following steps: (1) create the structure for the problem, (2) develop a model of the decisions,
5 uncertainties, and outcomes over time, (3) gather data for estimating outcome values in each
6 scenario, and (4) perform analysis comparing alternatives and identifying action plans.
7
8

9 10 2.4 Life cycle costing (LCC)

11 The LCC analysis concept was originally introduced by the U.S. Department of Defence
12 (DoD) in the 1970s (Ghosh *et al.*, 2018) to assist stakeholders and decision makers in
13 conducting systematic assessment of costs of a project or policy. Since then, it has been
14 applied to a wide variety of projects in different industries including oil and gas energy
15 (Fuller and Peterson, 1996). This approach has helped upstream oil and gas stakeholders
16 improve systems/components design, prioritize capital-intensive exploration activities,
17 support comparative assessment of two or more investment projects, optimize operation and
18 maintenance (O&M) strategies, determine whether life-extension is a viable consideration
19 when production equipment reach end of their lives, etc.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In contrast to CBA, the LCC method calculates all direct costs associated with a project
27 or a policy without taking indirect costs (or benefits) into account. The evaluation process
28 involves the summation of discounted cash flows that accrue cost elements over the life cycle
29 of a project/asset/policy with an appropriate discount rate. Over the last few years, the LCC
30 method has evolved with life cycle cost-benefit (LCCB) and activity-based life cycle costing
31 (AB-LCC) analysis approaches (for more see Thoft-Christensen, 2012; Animah *et al.*, 2018).
32 The disadvantage of the LCC approach is similar to those associated with the CBA method.
33 Thoft-christensen (2008) indicated the high discount rate set by different countries may
34 render this approach inaccurate.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 2.5 Environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA)

42 ELCA is a holistic and integrated approach for overall assessment of environmental
43 compatibility of a project, policy, an activity or a product over its whole life cycle. The
44 ELCA of a product comprises a “cradle-to-grave” assessment by considering the
45 environmental consequences of various phases of the product life cycle, including: raw
46 material acquisition phase, design/development phase, manufacturing phase, distribution
47 phase, O&M phase, and end-of-life phase (Jacquemin *et al.*, 2012).
48
49
50
51
52

53 Conducting a ELCA study in the upstream oil and gas industry can help field owners
54 better understand the material usage as well as environmental performance (such as emission
55 of greenhouse gases, including CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, H₂S, etc.) of various upstream operations
56 (exploration and production). For more details on ELCA applications in the upstream oil and
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 gas sector, readers can refer to the following references: [Aycaguer et al. \(2001\)](#); [Goodwin et](#)
2 [al. \(2012\)](#); [Garg et al. \(2013\)](#).

3 **2.6 Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS)**

4 MCS is a computerized mathematical method that relies on repeated random sampling and
5 statistical analysis to obtain numerical results. In this method, the likelihood of occurrence of
6 events are sampled at random from a probability distribution which is chosen based upon the
7 type of problem under investigation. Each discrete sample set is referred to as an iteration and
8 the resulting outcome from the calculations for that sample is recorded. This process will be
9 repeated hundreds or thousands of times to obtain an estimate of mean probability of
10 occurrence of the event. The accuracy of the estimate is dependent on the number of
11 iterations performed. MCS has been vastly used in many applications within the upstream oil
12 and gas. The applications include risk assessment, reservoir evaluation, hydraulic fracturing of
13 wells, and enhanced recovery processes ([Macmillan, 2000](#)).

14 **2.7 Decision Tree analysis (DTA)**

15 DTA uses graphical models to represent the sequence of decisions, events and their
16 anticipated outcomes ([Dey, 2002](#)). The analysis is structured in a form of a tree with branches
17 representing the possible action-event combinations. The conditional payoffs are obtained for
18 each decision by considering various action-event combinations. The DTA method is
19 appropriate when decision-making procedures are multi-stage, e.g. when an event takes place
20 over a sequence of stages. This makes the DTA method logically structured and suitable for
21 decision-making problems ([Dey, 2012](#)). According to [Cheldi et al. \(1997\)](#), DTA is used in the
22 oil and gas industry mainly for quantitative risk assessment. One important feature of the
23 DTA method is the calculation of expected monetary value (EMV), which is used as the basis
24 to compare different decision options and choose the best one.

25 **2.8 Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA)**

26 MCDA method is one of the popular and commonly used DMS methods in the oil and gas
27 energy industry. This method is increasingly becoming popular for decision-making in the
28 upstream sector because the conventional single-criterion decision-making approaches cannot
29 deliver appropriate results considering the complexity of field exploration and development
30 activities. The MCDA method provides a flexible approach to solve complex problems with
31 multiple attributes (e.g. technical, economic, social, legal and environmental) by helping
32 stakeholders to make clear and consistent decisions.

33 Up to date, several MCDA methods have been developed for solving complex decision-
34 making problems in the oil and gas industry. The most widely used MCDA methods include:
35 Weighted Sum Model (WSM), Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), Analytic Network Process
36 (ANP), Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT), Technique for Order of Preference by
37 Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS), Preference Ranking Organization Method Of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Enrichment Evaluation (PROMETHEE), Elimination and Choice Expressing Reality (ELECTRE), Vlsekriterijumska Optimizacija I KOmpromisno Resenje (VIKOR). A brief discussion of each of these methods, with an attempt to highlight advantages and disadvantages, follows.

2.8.1 *Weighted sum model (WSM)*

This is the best known and simplest MCDA method (Shafiee, 2015a). WSM is also referred to as the simple additive weighting (SAW) in the literature as it is suitable for handling single dimensional problems. The fundamental principle behind this method is to determine weighted sum of rating for each alternative considered in decision analysis. According to Kabir *et al.* (2014), to apply WSM correctly, all criteria should be single dimensional, i.e. cost-type or benefit-type. For this reason, Caterino *et al.* (2009) suggested that WSM is not efficient for solving complex decision-making problems which involve different types of criteria and decision variables.

2.8.2 *Analytic hierarchy process (AHP)*

The analytical hierarchy process (AHP) was developed by Saaty (1980) and since then this method has been applied to solve complex problems in various industries including oil and gas. The method helps decision makers to break down complex decision-making problems into hierarchical structure with goal at the top, followed by criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives (Zio, 1996). In AHP, to select the best alternative, decision-maker performs pairwise comparison of evaluation criteria and alternatives and then test the consistency of the pairwise comparison by computing an index called consistency ratio (CR). The weight for pairwise comparison is obtained using Saaty's fundamental scale of 1-9, where 1 indicates equal importance, 3 moderate importance, 5 strong importance, 7 very strong importance, and 9 indicates extreme importance. The values of 2, 4, 6, and 8 are assigned to indicate compromise values of importance.

2.8.3 *Analytic network process (ANP)*

The analytical network process (ANP) is a generalized form of the AHP method, but the difference is that in contact to AHP, the basic structures of ANP are networks. This is because AHP has been criticized for structuring the decision-making problems in hierarchical manner (Meade and Presley, 2002; Shafiee, 2015b). Also, Saaty (1996) suggested the use of ANP for solving the problems in which there is dependence between alternatives or criteria.

2.8.4 *Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT)*

This MCDA method takes into account the decision makers' preferences as a utility function for a set of possible attributes associated with alternatives. The best alternative is the one that maximizes the decision-makers' expected utility function. With respect to single attribute

1 utility, the utility function can either be separated additively or multiplicatively (Pohekar and
2 Ramachandran, 2004).

3 2.8.5 Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)

4 TOPSIS is a useful MCDA method for ranking and selection of alternatives based on distance
5 measures. The basic concept of this method is that the selected alternative should have the
6 shortest geometric distance from the positive ideal solution and the longest geometric
7 distance from the negative ideal solution. The TOPSIS method ranks alternatives in
8 ascending or descending order of preference, which makes it easier to identify the best
9 solution. Thus, decision makers' preference order of alternatives is obtained through
10 comparison of Euclidean distances (Pohekar and Ramachandran, 2004).

11 2.8.6 Preference Ranking Organization Method Of Enrichment Evaluation (PROMETHEE)

12 PROMETHEE was developed by Brans and Vincke (1985) to outrank a set of finite
13 alternatives with respect to conflicting criteria and then select the best alternative. The
14 PROMETHEE method uses positive and negative preference flows for different alternatives
15 in order to produce ranking in relation to decision weights (Kabir et al., 2014). There are
16 different methods of PROMETHEE described in the literature, including PROMETHEE I
17 (partial ranking), PROMETHEE II (complete ranking), PROMETHEE III (ranking based on
18 intervals), PROMETHEE IV (continuous case), PROMETHEE V (PROMETHEE II and
19 integer linear programming), PROMETHEE VI (weights of criteria are intervals) and
20 PROMETHEE GAIA (graphical representation of PROMETHEE) (Silva et al., 2010). The
21 most popular and commonly used techniques among the family of PROMETHEE methods
22 include PROMETHEE I and PROMETHEE II & II (Emovon et al., 2018). According to
23 Vinodh and Jeya Girubha (2012) PROMETHEE II is applied to rank alternatives because it
24 establishes a complete ranking or pre-order of alternatives.

25 2.8.7 Elimination and Choice Expressing Reality (ELECTRE)

26 ELECTRE uses an indirect method to rank alternatives by means of pair comparison under
27 each criteria (Cheng et al., 2002). Several versions of the ELECTRE method have been
28 developed since its conception in the mid-1960s (Kabir et al., 2014), with ELECTRE TRI
29 and ELECTRE III being the most popular and commonly used methods among the family of
30 ELECTRE methods. One of the key strength of ELECTRE is its applicability even when
31 there is missing information.

32 2.8.8 Vlsekriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje (VIKOR)

33 VIKOR is a compromising MCDA method that determines compromise ranking of
34 alternatives (Zeleny and Cochrane, 1982). The main objective of using this method is to
35 select a suitable alternative that is possibly close to the ideal solution. It introduces a multi-
36 criteria ranking index based on the particular measure of 'closeness' to the 'ideal' solution

(Sayadi *et al.*, 2009). The distance measure used in the VIKOR method is a family of L_p -metrics that is used as an aggregation function in a compromise programming.

2.9 Fuzzy logic analysis (FLA)

FLA is a powerful methodology which was introduced by Zadeh (1965) to deal with uncertainties in human judgments during decision-making. In FLA, fuzzy sets rather than crisp sets are used to determine the membership of a variable. Fuzzy sets are often presented by linguistic terms such as ‘low temperature’, ‘high pressure’, etc. In general, the output of a FLA is a fuzzy set expressed as a distribution of possibilities. FLA has been successfully applied in many different areas of upstream oil and gas sector, including reservoir characterization, drilling, permeability and rock type estimation, petroleum separation, and hydraulic fracturing (see Zoveidavianpoor *et al.*, 2012).

2.10 Artificial intelligence (AI)

AI is defined as the theory and development of computer systems able to support decision-making processes that normally require human intelligence. In other words, AI is the use of computer algorithms to attempt to replicate the human ability to learn, reason and make decisions. AI includes a wide range of techniques such as artificial neural networks (ANN), generic algorithm (GA), support vector machine (SVM), etc. Applications of AI tools in various operations of the upstream oil and gas sector can be found in the literature (see Mohaghegh and Khazaeni, 2011). For instance, for drilling decision-making the readers can refer to Bello *et al.* (2016), and for further details about oil production forecasting the readers are recommended to read Sheremetov *et al.* (2013).

2.11 Hybrid decision analysis methods

Hybrid decision analysis methods such as hybrid MCDA methods, combined MCDA and fuzzy logic methods, etc. are a powerful group of DMS methods which can assist decision-makers in handling miscellaneous information, divergence in stakeholders’ preferences, interconnected or contradicting criteria, and uncertain environments (Dinmohammadi and Shafiee, 2017).

2.11.1 Hybrid MCDA methods

Majority of the classical MCDA methods have practical limitations. In order to improve their strengths and eliminate their weaknesses, some hybrid MCDA models have been developed in the literature, e.g. SWM-AHP, ANP-TOPSIS. A hybrid MCDA method is an effective decision-making method which involves the integration of two or more appropriate MCDA methods for solving complex and multi-attribute problems. By this integration, limitations of one method can be offset by strengths of the other method.

2.11.2 Combined MCDA and fuzzy logic method

1 MCDA methods can be categorized into two types of crisp and fuzzy models (Shafiee,
2 2015a). The crisp MCDA models express the importance weights of criteria using crisp
3 numbers. However, it is sometimes difficult to provide precise numerical values for
4 evaluation criteria due to the uncertainty and vagueness in real-life decision-making
5 processes. The fuzzy MCDA models express the preferences of relative importance between
6 criteria by linguistic terms and then set them into fuzzy numbers such as triangular or
7 trapezoidal fuzzy numbers. A triangular fuzzy number is a fuzzy number whose membership
8 function is defined by three real numbers, expressed as (l, m, u) , where the function is first
9 linearly increasing from point $[l, 0]$ to $[m, 1]$ and then linearly decreasing to $[u, 0]$. m is called
10 the modal value, and l and u denote the right and left boundary respectively.

17 3. Review methodology and classification framework

19 In order to identify the available literature regarding the application of different DMS
20 methods in the upstream oil and gas industry, a systematic review was conducted. The
21 literature review covered all the studies published by scholars and practitioners throughout
22 the world in relevant journals and conference proceedings in English language between the
23 years 1977 and 2016.

24 The literature was identified from different databases such as Scopus, Web of Science,
25 Onepetrol, Knovel, IEEE Xplore, American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) digital
26 collection and Google scholar, and the related articles were selected based on a set of
27 inclusion criteria. The above indexing databases were selected due to their broad coverage of
28 scientific peer-reviewed journal articles as well as conference papers. Several keywords and
29 phrases such as “decision-making”, “upstream petroleum”, “oil and gas”, “decision analysis”,
30 “methods”, “techniques” in different combinations were used to identify the existing
31 literature. The keyword search resulted in a total of 129 papers. The title and abstract of each
32 paper were then reviewed to assess their relevance to the topic. After reviewing the titles and
33 abstracts, 19 papers were discarded due to their irrelevance to the subject area and eventually,
34 110 papers were selected for inclusion in this study. These papers are: Korn *et al.* (1978);
35 Sprowso *et al.* (1979); Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988); Balen *et al.* (1988); Methven (1993);
36 Roosmalen *et al.* (1993); Songhurst and Kingsley (1993); Dear *et al.* (1995); Heinze *et al.*
37 (1995); Smith and Celant (1995); Lassen and Syvertsen (1996); Harding (1996); Winkel
38 (1996); Cheldi *et al.* (1997); Smith *et al.* (1997); Iyer *et al.* (1998); Joshi *et al.* (1998);
39 Poremiski (1998); Denney (1999); Gatta (1999); Mudford (2000); Tague and Hollman (2000);
40 Aycaguer *et al.* (2001); Erdogan *et al.* (2001); Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001); Goldsmith
41 *et al.* (2001); Paula *et al.* (2001); Suslick and Furtado (2001); Suslick *et al.* (2001); Begg *et al.*
42 (2002); Castro *et al.* (2002); Denney (2002); Finch *et al.* (2002); Balch *et al.* (2003);
43 Cullick *et al.* (2003); El-Reedy (2003); Joshi (2003); Chitwood *et al.* (2004); Ferreira *et al.*
44 (2004); Vorarat *et al.* (2004); Hegstad *et al.* (2005); Islam and Powell (2005); Brainard

(2006); Cullick *et al.* (2007); Lev and Murphy (2007); Moan (2007); Bahmannia (2008); Ghazi *et al.* (2008); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2008); Liu and Ford (2008); Orimo *et al.* (2008); Virine (2008); Zhu and Arcos (2008); Abhulimen (2009); Bybee (2009); Gomez *et al.* (2009); Jafarizadeh and Bratvold (2009); Li *et al.* (2009); Verre *et al.* (2009); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2010); Ratnayaka and Markeset (2010); Pinturier *et al.* (2010); Angert *et al.* (2011); Chen *et al.* (2011); Gong *et al.* (2011); Kayrbekova *et al.* (2011); Nam *et al.* (2011); Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011); Stephenson *et al.* (2011); Streeter and Moody (2011); Burnham *et al.* (2012); Goodwin *et al.* (2012); Grosse-Sommer *et al.* (2012); Schulze *et al.* (2012); Shrivastva *et al.* (2012); Weber and Clavin (2012); Zoveidavianpoor *et al.* (2012); Burlini and Araruna (2013); Hernandez *et al.* (2013); Lopes and Almeida (2013); Pettersen *et al.* (2013); Pierce and Wills (2013); Sheremetov *et al.* (2013); Trujillo *et al.* (2013); Fergestad *et al.* (2014); Fowler *et al.* (2014); Jeong *et al.* (2014); Kullawan *et al.* (2014); Lilien *et al.* (2014); Maddah *et al.* (2014); Marten and Gatzen (2014); Sandler *et al.* (2014); Siveter *et al.* (2014); Wright *et al.* (2014); Chilukuri *et al.* (2015); Chun *et al.* (2015); de Wardt and Peterson (2015); Ghani *et al.* (2015); Oruganti *et al.* (2015); Silitonga (2015); Zavala-Araiza *et al.* (2015); Adam and Ghosh (2016); Bello *et al.* (2016); Guedes and Santos (2016); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016a); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016b); Ortiz-Volcan *et al.* (2016); Seo *et al.* (2016); Shafiee *et al.* (2016); Steuten and Onna (2016).

The full text of each paper was reviewed carefully and a classification framework was presented to categorize the existing literature. As shown in Figure 1, the state-of-the-art of methods used to support decision-making in the upstream oil and gas industry can be classified according to the following attributes:

****Figure 1****

Figure 1. Classification framework for decision-making support methods applied to the upstream oil and gas sector.

- Year of publications (1977–1986, 1987–1996, 1997–2006, 2007–2016);
- Distribution of publications (type of publication, source of publication);
- Types of fossil fuel sources (conventional, non-conventional);
- Oil and gas field’s lifecycle phases (exploration, development, production, life extension, abandonment/decommission);
- Data collection techniques (survey, direct measurement or observation, monitoring and data acquisition systems, others);
- Decision support methods (OR, CBA, ROA, LCC, ELCA, MCS, DTA, MCDA, FLA, AI, and Hybrid methods);
- Geographical distribution of case studies and their locations (Asia, South America, North America, Europe, Africa).

4. Review findings and classification results

In this section, the observation and findings of the review classification process are reported in details.

4.1 Distribution of studies based on year of publication

We divided the period of study into four equal decades of ten years each—1977 to 1986, 1987 to 1996, 1997 to 2006, and 2007 to 2016. Figure 2 depicts a bar chart representing the number of papers published about the application of DMS methods to upstream oil and gas operations during the past four decades.

**** Figure 2****

Figure 2. The number of publications during the past four decades.

As can be seen, there is a significant increase in the number of papers over the period of study. However, more than 60 percent of the studies have been published in the past ten years (2007-2016), which implies the increasing importance and usefulness of DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas sector.

4.2 Distribution of studies based on type of source of publications

Out of the 110 identified papers, there were thirty-two journal articles (~ 29%) (Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988); Dear *et al.* (1995); Iyer *et al.* (1998); Denney (1999); Aycaguer *et al.* (2001); Suslick and Furtado (2001); Denney (2002); Finch *et al.* (2002); Ferreira *et al.* (2004); Moan (2007); Bybee (2009); Li *et al.* (2009); Ratnayaka and Markeset (2010); Kayrbekova *et al.* (2011); Nam *et al.* (2011); Stephenson *et al.* (2011); Burnham *et al.* (2012); Goodwin *et al.* (2012); Weber and Clavin (2012); Zoveidavianpoor *et al.* (2012); Lopes and Almeida (2013); Sheremetov *et al.* (2013); Fowler *et al.* (2014); Maddah *et al.* (2014); Marten and Gatzen (2014); Sandler *et al.* (2014); Ghani *et al.* (2015); Silitonga (2015); Zavala-Araiza *et al.* (2015); Guedes and Santos (2016); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016b); Shafiee *et al.* (2016)) and seventy-eight conference papers (~ 71%) (Korn *et al.* (1978); Sprowso *et al.* (1979); Balen *et al.* (1988); Methven (1993); Roosmalen *et al.* (1993); Songhurst and Kingsley (1993); Heinze *et al.* (1995); Smith and Celant (1995); Lassen and Syvertsen (1996); Harding (1996); Winkel (1996); Cheldi *et al.* (1997); Smith *et al.* (1997); Joshi *et al.* (1998); Poremski (1998); Gatta (1999); Mudford (2000); Tague and Hollman (2000); Erdogan *et al.* (2001); Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001); Goldsmith *et al.* (2001); Paula *et al.* (2001); Suslick *et al.* (2001); Begg *et al.* (2002); Castro *et al.* (2002); Balch *et al.* (2003); Cullick *et al.* (2003); El-Reedy (2003); Joshi (2003); Chitwood *et al.* (2004); Vorarat *et al.* (2004); Hegstad *et al.* (2005); Islam and Powell (2005); Brainard (2006); Cullick *et al.* (2007); Lev and Murphy (2007); Bahmannia (2008); Ghazi *et al.* (2008); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2008); Liu and Ford (2008); Orimo *et al.* (2008); Virine (2008); Zhu and Arcos (2008); Abhulimen (2009); Gomez *et al.* (2009); Jafarizadeh and Bratvold (2009); Verre *et*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

al. (2009); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2010); Pinturier *et al.* (2010); Angert *et al.* (2011); Chen *et al.* (2011); Gong *et al.* (2011); Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011); Streeter and Moody (2011); Grosse-Sommer *et al.* (2012); Schulze *et al.* (2012); Shrivastva *et al.* (2012); Burlini and Araruna (2013); Hernandez *et al.* (2013); Pettersen *et al.* (2013); Pierce and Wills (2013); Trujillo *et al.* (2013); Fergestad *et al.* (2014); Jeong *et al.* (2014); Kullawan *et al.* (2014); Lilien *et al.* (2014); Siveter *et al.* (2014); Wright *et al.* (2014); Chilukuri *et al.* (2015); Chun *et al.* (2015); de Wardt and Peterson (2015); Oruganti *et al.* (2015); Adam and Ghosh (2016); Bello *et al.* (2016); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016a); Ortiz-Volcan *et al.* (2016); Seo *et al.* (2016); Steuten and Onna (2016)).

We also identified the sources of journals and conference proceedings in which the papers were published. It was found that the literature has been scattered among twenty-seven academic journals and thirty-eight conference proceedings. Among the journals, the “Journal of Petroleum Technology” – which is published by the Society of Petroleum Engineers (SPE) – contained the largest number of papers on the topic (4 papers). Furthermore, about 60 percent of the conference papers have been published in proceedings for the SPE oil and gas energy conferences, amongst which the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition with 8 papers is the most dominant event.

4.3 Distribution of studies based on fossil fuel sources

The upstream oil and gas sector involves the exploration and development of conventional fossil fuel reserves as well as unconventional fossil fuel deposits such as shale oil and gas. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) (<https://www.eia.gov/>) projected that shale gas production is expected to reach 90 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d) in 2040, which is more than twice current levels. However, the geological and technical approaches employed in the exploration and development of shale gas differ from those of the conventional oil and gas. Some of the important issues in the shale oil and gas sector that may require the use of DMS methods include the evaluation of cost of exploration, development and production, estimation of revenues, and the examination of the environmental impact of shale oil and gas production over the life span of a field.

Those studies that have discussed or applied different DMS methods to support the development of both conventional and unconventional fossil fuel sources in the upstream oil and gas sector were identified and reviewed. Out of 110 studies included in this review, only five papers (representing around 4.5 percent of all studies) addressed the decision-making processes regarding shale gas production and GHG emission effects, while the rest of the studies focused on decision-making aspects of the conventional fossil fuel sources. These five studies about the shale gas production and GHG footprint assessment are highlighted below:

Gong *et al.* (2011) presented a decline-curve-based reservoir model with a decision model to determine optimal development strategies in shale reservoirs by incorporating uncertainty in production forecasts. Stephenson *et al.* (2011) modelled the relative GHG

emissions from both shale gas and conventional natural gas production. One of the key findings of the study was that the well-to-wire (WtW) emissions from conventional natural gas production were **estimated** to be approximately 1.8%-2.4% less than that of shale gas. **Burnham et al. (2012)** **synthesized** the current scientific knowledge on methane emissions from shale gas, conventional oil and gas as well as coal to estimate GHG emissions from different fossil fuel sources. The study further indicated that the combustion of natural gas produces significantly less GHG as compared to conventional coal and oil sources. In **Weber and Clavin (2012)**, the upstream carbon footprint from both shale and conventional natural gas production was assessed and compared. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the upstream carbon footprint from these two types of natural gas production. **Zavala-Araiza et al. (2015)** used a life-cycle allocation method to assign methane emissions to natural gas and oil production from shale formations.

4.4 Distribution of studies based on oil and gas field's lifecycle phases

In this Section, the reviewed papers are classified according to the phases of oil and gas field lifecycle. **The lifecycle, as shown in Figure 3, is divided into five phases of exploration, development, production, life extension, and abandonment/decommission. These lifecycle phases are briefly explained in the followings:**

**** Figure 3****

Figure 3. The lifecycle phases of an oil and gas field.

- Exploration phase: This phase involves the search for economic and recoverable oil and natural gas deposits (either onshore or offshore) and **includes detailed surface exploration, drilling and well testing.**
- Development phase: **The development phase occurs after exploration. The main activities during this phase include construction of production facilities, water injection and abandonment wells, an FPSO, subsea structures, etc., laying of flow lines and umbilicals, and installation of subsea systems for subsequent commencement of oil and gas production.**
- Production phase: This phase employs various skills, advanced technologies and professionals to extract **oil and gas products and subsequently separate two- or three-phase products** into oil, gas, produced water and solid particles. The oil and natural gas products are then transported to the agreed delivery points either through the use of export lines or shuttle tankers in the case of offshore production. **This phase also involves workover operations of production wells and maintenance of oil and gas production facilities which is carried out to ensure effective and efficient production.**
- Life extension phase: This phase begins when oil and gas production facilities reach end of their original design lifetimes and the process of life extension is economically and

1 technically viable. Also, in some countries due to highly restrictive regulations on
2 construction of new fields, companies use life extension as means to avoid phasing out
3 existing fields. Life extension of oil and gas facilities delivers **some** benefits such as
4 increased production, **reduced capital expenditures (CAPEX) associated with**
5 **constructing new facility, increased job creation, reduced CO₂ emissions, and lowered**
6 **financial risk** compared to risk of investing in greenfield project (Shafiee and Animah,
7 2017).

- 8
9
10
11 - Abandonment/Decommission: This phase represents the final stage of oil and gas field's
12 lifecycle, **taking** place when production facilities are no longer safe or cannot produce
13 economic quantities of oil and gas products. Oil and gas field abandonment is a critical
14 and complex decision-making process which involves the use of DMS methods in terms
15 of risk analysis, cost estimation, health and safety, and environmental assessment (Kaiser
16 and Pulsipher, 2004). Typical decommissioning activities include well plugging, full
17 removal of platforms, partial removal platforms, trenching and burial of pipelines, etc.
18 (Koroma *et al.*, 2018).
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Table 1** shows a detailed distribution of the published papers on the application of DMS
25 methods in upstream **oil and gas industry according to the phases of oil and gas field's**
26 **lifecycle taken into consideration.** Those publications which did not report the phase of
27 lifecycle in the decision-making process were excluded from the table. **As can be seen, the**
28 **DMS methods have received the most attention during the development phase, followed by**
29 **the production and exploration phases.**
30
31
32
33
34

35 ****Table 1****

36
37 **Table 1.** Distribution of studies **according to the** oil and gas field's lifecycle phases.
38
39

40 *4.5 Distribution of studies based on data collection techniques*

41 Decision-making in relation to the upstream **oil and gas** activities **should** be reliant on
42 **accurate** data for the analysis. This means that the outcomes of a decision are dependent upon
43 the quality of input data, hence making data collection an essential step of decision-making
44 process in the upstream **oil and gas** sector. Applying the DMS methods to make effective
45 decisions usually requires a database of cost information (e.g. cost of design, operation and
46 maintenance (O&M), decommissioning, etc.), equipment failure mechanisms and root causes,
47 degradation rates, environmental data (e.g. CO_{2eq} as a results of production and operation of
48 equipment) as well as experts' opinions about the evaluating criteria. **Without using high**
49 **quality data,** the results of decision-making may lead to inaccurate conclusions. In a study,
50 *Vorarat et al.* (2004) discussed the data requirements for LCC analysis of oil and gas field
51 projects.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Generally, the use of survey methods (including questionnaires, face-to-face or telephone
2 interviews, or a combination of these) to obtain experts' judgement and knowledge is one of
3 common data collection techniques in the oil and gas sector (Virine, 2008). Many researchers
4 often consider survey techniques more subjective and, thus, less accurate than experimentally
5 acquired data. Nevertheless, it still remains one of the popular ways of data collection for
6 decision-making in the upstream oil and gas sector. Another means of obtaining data for
7 decision-making is through direct measurement or observation (such as close visual
8 inspection (CVI)). The data stored in monitoring databases or data acquisition systems is also
9 another source for decision makers in the upstream oil and gas industry. Additionally,
10 information from other primary/original sources such as published literature, company's
11 reports, legislations of regulators, suppliers' databases, etc. is also used for decision analysis
12 in the upstream sector.

13 Among the reviewed papers, Aycaguer *et al.* (2001) used data generated from the
14 continuous monitoring of a process safety system to perform ELCA, in order to assess the
15 benefits obtained from storing CO₂ in active reservoirs and its corresponding environmental
16 impact over the process lifetime. Eight studies, including Gatta (1999), Bahmannia (2008),
17 Abhulimen (2009), Pinturier *et al.* (2010), Nam *et al.* (2011), Kullawan *et al.* (2014), Sandler
18 *et al.* (2014) and Ghani *et al.* (2015) have utilized data from published literature and
19 handbooks.

20 In Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988), Dear *et al.* (1995), Smith and Celant (1995), Gerbacia
21 and Al-Shammari (2001), Islam and Powell (2005), Goodwin *et al.* (2012), Wright *et al.*
22 (2014) and Shafiee *et al.* (2016), the information from industry was used as input to support
23 ELCA and CBA analyses. Studies conducted by Johannknecht *et al.* (2016a) and
24 Johannknecht *et al.* (2016b) collected data from previously commercialized products to
25 develop a LCC toolkit. Ghazi *et al.* (2008) and Ratnayaka and Markeset (2010) combined
26 different data collection techniques in their respective studies. Eight studies of Joshi *et al.*
27 (1998), Suslick and Furtado (2001), Suslick *et al.* (2001), Li *et al.* (2009), Verre *et al.* (2009),
28 Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011), Streeter and Moody (2011) and Sandler *et al.* (2014)
29 applied data acquired from other projects/fields to support decision-making in the upstream
30 oil and gas sector.

31 The rest of the publications failed to indicate the type of techniques used for collecting
32 the data and hence were excluded from our analysis.

33 4.6 Distribution of studies based on DMS methods

34 In terms of the decision-making methods employed in the upstream oil and gas sector, all the
35 one-hundred and ten identified publications were analysed and classified into various
36 categories as follows:

- 37 • Operational research (OR)
- 38 • Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)

- Real options analysis (ROA)
- Life cycle costing (LCC)
- Environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA)
- Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS)
- Decision tree analysis (DTA)
- MCDA (WSM, AHP/ANP, MAUT, TOPSIS, PROMETHEE, ECLECTRE, VIKOR)
- Hybrid MCDA (when a study combines two or more MCDA methods);
- Fuzzy logic analysis (FLA)
- Others (when a decision-making method different from those mentioned above is used).

The distribution of the publications based on the method used to support decision-making in the upstream oil and gas is shown in Table 2. As can be seen, LCC method with 39 papers has received the most attention in the literature, followed by ELCA with 18 papers, CBA with 14 papers, DTA with 10 papers and MCDA methods with 10 papers. Another interesting observation from Table 2 is that the classical MAUT and AHP/ANP methods are the most popular MCDA methods to support decision-making in the upstream sector, whereas other MCDA methods such as WSM, TOPSIS, PROMETHEE, ELECTRE and VIKOR have not been extensively utilized. Moreover, our search revealed that only one study in the literature has used the fuzzy set theory approach.

****Table 2****

Table 2. Classification of studies based on decision-making methods.

Figure 4 shows a detailed distribution of various DMS methods applied to the upstream oil and gas sector during the past four decades.

****Figure 4****

Figure 4. Distribution of DMS methods applied to the upstream sector during the past four decades.

4.7 Distribution of studies based on geographical location of case studies

The results of our content analysis indicate that 38 out of 110 publications (i.e. about 34.5 percent of the total number of publications) have reported a case example of the application of DMS methods to the upstream oil and gas sector. Out of these 38 published works, 27 studies have mentioned the geographical location of the case study. Table 3 presents the aim and the geographical location and of the identified case studies around the world.

****Table 3****

Table 3. Distribution of studies based on geographical location of case studies.

1 As can be seen, the continents of North and South America have reported the largest
2 number of case studies, accounting for 41 percent of the total number of publications. This is
3 followed by the Middle East region and Asia with 30 percent of the publications. The North
4 Sea which comprises the UK Continental Shelf (UKCS) and Norwegian Continental Shelf
5 (NCS) account for 15 percent of the publications. Mediterranean Sea and West Africa regions
6 also have been studied each in 7% of the case studies.
7
8
9

10 5. Concluding remarks and future research directions

11 Over the past four decades, a wide range of qualitative and quantitative decision-making
12 support (DMS) methods have been developed in the literature to assist upstream oil and gas
13 industry stakeholders to better understand reservoir characteristics, simulate field operations,
14 develop low carbon production technologies, and make justifiable business decisions
15 regarding field exploration, development and production activities. In this paper, we reviewed
16 one hundred and ten studies (including 32 journal articles and 78 conference papers) about
17 the use of different DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas industry. These studies were
18 published by many scholars and practitioners throughout the world in twenty-seven academic
19 journals and thirty-eight conference proceedings in English language between the years 1977
20 and 2016. The key issues of the subject area, including the type of DMS methods applied to
21 support the decision-makers, the phases of oil and gas field's lifecycle considered in the
22 analysis, data collection techniques, case study regions that have utilised DMS methods to
23 solve the problem, etc. were highlighted and discussed.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 As this study revealed, the number of publications related to the application of DMS
35 methods in the upstream oil and gas industry have grown significantly over the past four
36 decades. The analysis of the studies based on decision-making methods indicated that the
37 operational research (OR) methods such as mixed integer programming (MIP), economic
38 analysis methods such as cost-benefit analysis (CBA), real options analysis (ROA) and life
39 cycle costing (LCC), statistical methods such as Monte Carlo simulation (MCS) and decision
40 tree analysis (DTA); and environmental assessment methods such as environmental life cycle
41 assessment (ELCA) have received the most attention in the literature. However, the use of
42 multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) methods such as analytic hierarchy process (AHP)
43 and analytic network process (ANP) have been gaining momentum in recent years. Such
44 methods are able to consider simultaneously multiple technical, economic, social, legal and
45 environmental attributes of decision-making problems in the upstream sector. Moreover, in
46 order to account for uncertainties associated with practitioners' subjective perception and
47 experience in decision-making, soft computing methods such as fuzzy set theory, rough set
48 theory, artificial intelligence (AI), and neural networks (NN) have become popular.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 The findings of this literature review and the results of the proposed classification
59 scheme offer interesting conclusions that could be useful to field owners, asset managers,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 service providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies
2 to gain better insight about their business activities with well-informed decision-making
3 processes, find out how to determine the most effective DMS method for each problem, and
4 to identify real-life applications and case studies. However, there is still large scope of
5 research on the use of decision analytics modelling in the upstream, midstream and
6 downstream oil and gas sectors. Some of the potential directions for future research are listed
7 below:
8
9

- 10 1. When comparing the number of studies that have used DMS methods to support decision
11 analysis of exploration, development and production activities of conventional and
12 unconventional fossil fuel sources, it was realised that unconventional fossil fuel (such as
13 shale oil and gas) has received very little attention in the literature. Hence, further
14 research works can be conducted on various aspects of decision-making for the
15 exploration, development and production of shale oil and gas.
16
- 17 2. It was found from this review that all the studies in relation to unconventional fossil fuel
18 sources utilized ELCA method to estimate GHG footprint of shale gas production.
19 Nevertheless, the development and production of shale gas present huge economic
20 opportunities and it will be of great interest if future research work can use other decision
21 analytics methods to estimate the economic potential of shale gas projects.
22
- 23 3. The majority of the DMS methods identified in this study were data-driven and required
24 good quality data so that decisions could be made with high degree of confidence.
25 However, the paucity of good quality data is still considered as a challenge in the
26 upstream oil and gas sector. In order to overcome this challenge, there is an essential
27 need for the stakeholders to define measures, procedures, and data collection platforms
28 capable of providing decision makers with appropriate information to make suitable
29 decisions.
30
- 31 4. Our findings indicated that decision-making tools such as LCC, ELCA, CBA, DTA,
32 MCS and ROA have received good attention in industrial case studies. However, MCDA
33 methods and also hybrid decision analysis methods have rarely been reported to be
34 applied to real-case projects in the upstream oil and gas sector.
35
- 36 5. Despite the wide application of AHP/ANP methods to solve decision-making problems
37 in the upstream oil and gas industry, the literature on the use of other MCDA methods
38 such as TOPSIS, PROMETHEE, ELECTRE, VIKOR and fuzzy MCDA techniques is
39 very limited.
40
- 41 6. Life extension and field abandonment/decommission are the current challenges facing
42 the upstream oil and gas sector. This is because significant number of facilities
43 supporting operations in the upstream oil and gas sector are approaching or have already
44 exceeded their original design lifetimes and asset managers have to make a decision
45 between life extension and decommissioning. However, very few research studies have
46 used DMS methods to address the challenges of life extension and/or decommissioning
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 decision-making in the oil and gas industry (Shafiee and Animah, 2017). Therefore,
2 future work must direct efforts at applying DMS to address the challenges during life
3 extension and decommission phase of asset life cycle in the upstream oil and gas sector.

- 4
5 7. This review revealed that the West Africa region, though produces a sizeable amount of
6 the crude oil and natural gas, has reported the least number of case studies about the
7 application of DMS method to provide robust solutions for exploration, development and
8 production activities. Therefore, further researches can be conducted about this region in
9 the future.
10
11
12
13

14 References

- 16 Abhulimen, K. (2009). Optimal life-cycle model for ranking environmental performance of E&P
17 programs, in: *SPE Americas E&P Environmental and Safety Conference*, 23-25 March, San
18 Antonio, Texas, USA, pp. 1–43.
19
20 Adam, S. and Ghosh, S. (2016). Application of flexible composite pipe as a cost effective alternative
21 to carbon steel - design experience, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Asia*, 22-25 March,
22 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–12.
23
24 Angert, P.F., Isebor, O.J. and Litvak, M.L. (2011). Early life cycle field development optimization of
25 a complex deepwater Gulf of Mexico field, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Brasil*, 4-6
26 October, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, pp. 1–12.
27
28 Animah, I. and Shafiee, M. (2018). Condition assessment, remaining useful life prediction and life
29 extension decision making for offshore oil and gas assets. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the*
30 *Process Industries* 53, 17-28.
31
32 Animah, I., Shafiee, M., Simms, N., Erkoyuncu, J.A. and Maiti, J. (2018) Selection of the most
33 suitable life extension strategy for ageing offshore assets using a life-cycle cost-benefit analysis
34 approach. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, 24(3), [https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-](https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-09-2016-0041)
35 [09-2016-0041](https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-09-2016-0041).
36
37 Aycaguer, A., Lev-On, M. and Winer, A. M. (2001). Reducing carbon dioxide emissions with
38 enhanced Oil recovery projects: A life cycle assessment approach. *Energy Fuels* 15, 303–308.
39
40 Bahmannia, G. (2008). Life cycle assessment (LCA) in oil and gas industries as an effective
41 sustainability development measure: case study. Sarkhoon gas treating plant, in: *19th World*
42 *Petroleum Congress*, 29 June-3 July, Madrid, Spain, pp. 1–14.
43
44 Balch, E.R., Kavanagh, W.K., Griffin, P.E., Chouinard, L.E., Mechanics, A., Cooper, C. and
45 Thompson, H.M. (2003). Running fairings for deepwater drilling in the Gulf of Mexico – a cost-
46 benefit approach to deciding the faired length, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 5-8 May,
47 Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1–7.
48
49 Balen, R., Mens, H.-Z. and Economides, M. (1988). Applications of the Net Present Value (NPV) in
50 the optimization of hydraulic fractures, in: *SPE Eastern Regional Meeting*, 1-4 November,
51 Charleston, West Virginia, USA, 11 pages.
52
53 Bello, O., Teodoriu, C., Yaqoob, T., Oppelt, J., Holzmann, J., Obiwanne, A. (2016). Application of
54 artificial intelligence techniques in drilling system design and operations: a state of the art
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 review and future research pathways. In: *SPE Nigeria Annual International Conference and*
2 *Exhibition, 2-4 August, Lagos, Nigeria.*
- 3 Begg, S., Bratvold, R. and Campbell, J. (2002). The value of flexibility in managing uncertainty in oil
4 and gas investments. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition, 29 September-2*
5 *October, San Antonio, Texas, USA.*
- 6
- 7 Brainard, R.R. (2006). A process used in evaluation of managed-pressure drilling candidates and
8 probabilistic cost-benefit analysis, in: *Offshore Technology Conference, 1-4 May, Houston,*
9 *Texas, USA, 13 pages.*
- 10
- 11 Brans, J.-P. and Vincke, P. (1985). Note—A preference ranking organisation method: (The
12 PROMETHEE method for multiple criteria decision-making). *Management Science* 31, 647–
13 656.
- 14
- 15 Bratvold, R.B., Bickel, J.E., Risk, A. and Lohne, H.P. (2009). Value of information in the oil and gas
16 industry: past, present, and future. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* 12(4), 630–638.
- 17
- 18 Burlini, P.S. and Araruna, J.T. (2013). Life Cycle Concept (LCC) in the waste management in the
19 O&G offshore exploration. in: *North Africa Technical Conference and Exhibition, 15-17 April,*
20 *Cairo, Egypt, pp. 1514–1518.*
- 21
- 22 Burnham, A., Han, J., Clark, C.E., Wang, M., Dunn, J.B. and Palou-Rivera, I. (2012). Life-cycle
23 greenhouse gas emissions of shale gas, natural gas, coal, and petroleum. *Environmental Science*
24 *& Technology, 46(2), 619–627.*
- 25
- 26 Bybee, K. (2009). The judgment-elicitation process for multicriteria decision making. *Journal of*
27 *Petroleum Technology, 61(10), 60–62.*
- 28
- 29 Castro, G.T., Morooka, C.K. and Bordalo, S.N. (2002). Decision-making process for a deepwater
30 production system considering environmental, technological and financial risks, in: *SPE Annual*
31 *Technical Conference and Exhibition, 29 September-2 October, San Antonio, Texas, USA, pp.*
32 *1–8.*
- 33
- 34 Caterino, N., Iervolino, I., Manfredi, G. and Cosenza, E. (2009). Comparative analysis of multi-
35 criteria decision-making methods for seismic structural retrofitting. *Computer-Aided Civil and*
36 *Infrastructure Engineering* 24(6), 432–445.
- 37
- 38 Cheldi, T., Cavaasi, P., Lazzari, L. and Pezzotta, L. (1997). Use of decision tree analysis and Monte
39 Carlo simulation, in: *NACE-International Conference on Corrosion, 9-14 March, New Orleans,*
40 *Louisiana, USA, pp. 1–10.*
- 41
- 42 Chen, C., Li, G. and Reynolds, A.C. (2011). Robust constrained optimization of short and long-term
43 NPV for closed-loop reservoir management, in: *SPE Reservoir Simulation Symposium, 21-23*
44 *February, The Woodlands, Texas, USA. pp. 1–23.*
- 45
- 46 Cheng, S., Chan, C. and Huang, G.H. (2002). Using multiple criteria decision analysis for supporting
47 decision of solid waste management. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part A:*
48 *Toxic/Hazardous Substances and Environmental Engineering, 37(6), 975–990.*
- 49
- 50 Chilukuri, P., Bowerbank, G. and Bhattacharya, A. (2015). Understanding the impact of hydrocarbon
51 co-absorption losses on revenues from your Gas Plants : The reality through life-cycle costs, in:
52 *International Petroleum Technology Conference, 6-9 December, Doha, Qatar, pp. 1–10.*
- 53
- 54 Chitwood, J.E., Wanvik, L., Doreen Chin, Y. and Sheets, B.J. (2004). Techno-economic evaluations
55 of deepwater marginal field developments, in: *Offshore Technology Conference, 3-6 May,*
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1844–1853.

1 Chun, N.A.A.P., Bravo, R.J.C. and Quiñones, V.A.H. (2015). Forecasting reservoir management
2 through life cycle assessment: case study Marañón basin, in: *SPE Latin American and*
3 *Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference*, 18-20 November, Quito, Ecuador, pp. 1–26.

4 Cullick, A.S., Cude, R.G. and Tarman, M. (2007). Optimizing field development concepts for
5 complex offshore production systems. In: *SPE Offshore Europe*, 4-7 September, Aberdeen,
6 Scotland, U.K.

7 Cullick, A.S., Heath, D., Narayanan, K., April, J. and Kelly, J. (2003). Optimizing multiple-field
8 scheduling and production strategy with reduced risk. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and*
9 *Exhibition*, 5-8 October, Denver, Colorado, USA.

10 de Wardt, J.P. and Peterson, S.K. (2015). Well cost estimation and control - advanced methodologies
11 for effective, in: *SPE/IADC Drilling Conference and Exhibition*, 17-19 March, London,
12 England, UK. pp. 1–18.

13 Dear, S., Beasley, R.D. and Barr, K.P. (1995). Use of a decision tree to select the mud system for the
14 Oso field, Nigeria. *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 47(10), 909–912.

15 Denney, D. (1999). Monobores improve life-cycle cost. *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 51(2), 1–2.

16 Denney, D. (2002). Multicriteria decision-making in strategic reservoir planning. *Journal of*
17 *Petroleum Technology* 54(9), 83–84.

18 Deore, P. (2012). Decision making in upstream oil and gas industry - an integrated approach, in: *SPE*
19 *Oil and Gas India Conference and Exhibition*, 28-30 March, Mumbai, India. pp. 1–5.

20 Dey, P.K. (2002). Project risk management: a combined analytic hierarchy process and decision tree
21 approach. *Cost Engineering* 44(3), 13–26.

22 Dey, P.K. (2012). Project risk management using multiple criteria decision-making technique and
23 decision tree analysis: a case study of Indian oil refinery. *Production Planning & Control*
24 23(12), 903–921.

25 Dinmohammadi, A. and Shafiee, M. (2017). Determination of the most suitable technology transfer
26 strategy for wind turbines using an integrated AHP-TOPSIS decision model. *Energies*, 10(5), 17
27 pages.

28 El-Reedy, M.A. (2003). Life-cycle cost design of deteriorating offshore structures, in: *Offshore*
29 *Mediterranean Conference*, 26-28 March, Ravenna, Italy, pp. 1–7.

30 Emovon, I., Norman, R.A. and Murphy, A.J. (2018). Hybrid MCDM based methodology for selecting
31 the optimum maintenance strategy for ship machinery systems. *Journal of Intelligent*
32 *Manufacturing* 29(3), 519–531.

33 Erdogan, M., Mudford, B., Chenoweth, G., Holeywell, R. and Jakubson, J. (2001). Optimization of
34 decision tree and simulation portfolios- A comparison, in: *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and*
35 *Evaluation Symposium*, 2-3 April, Dallas, Texas, USA, pp. 1–8.

36 Fergestad, D., Løtveit, S.A. and Leira, B.J. (2014). Life-cycle assessment of flexible risers, in: *33rd*
37 *International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, 8–13 June, San
38 Francisco, California, USA, pp. 1–10.

39 Ferreira, D., Suslick, S., Farley, J., Costanza, R. and Krivov, S. (2004). A decision model for financial
40 assurance instruments in the upstream petroleum sector, *Energy Policy* 32, 1173–1184.

41 Finch, J.H., Macmillan, F.E. and Simpson, G.S. (2002). On the diffusion of probabilistic investment
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

appraisal and decision-making procedures in the UK's upstream oil and gas industry, *Research Policy* 31(6), 969-988.

Fowler, A.M., Macreadie, P.I., Jones, D.O.B. and Booth, D.J. (2014). A multi-criteria decision approach to decommissioning of offshore oil and gas infrastructure. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 87, 20–29.

Fuller, S. and Peterson, S. (1996). *Life cycle costing manual for the federal energy management program*. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Washington, USA, 210 pages.

Garg, A., Vishwanathan, S. and Avashia, V. (2013). Life cycle greenhouse gas emission assessment of major petroleum oil products for transport and household sectors in India. *Energy Policy* 58, 38–48.

Gatta, S.R. (1999). Decision tree analysis and risk modeling to appraise investments on major oil field projects, in: *Middle East Oil Show and Conference*, 20-23 February, Bahrain, pp. 1–16.

Gerbacia, W.E. and Al-Shammari, H. (2001). Multi-criteria decision making in strategic reservoir planning using the analytic hierarchy process, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 30 September-3 October, New Orleans, Louisiana. pp. 1–12.

Ghani, A., Khan, F. and Garaniya, V. (2015). Improved oil recovery using CO₂ as an injection medium: a detailed analysis. *Journal of Petroleum Exploration and Production Technology* 5(3), 241–254.

Ghazi, M., Quaranta, G., Duplay, J. and Khodja, M. (2008). Life-cycle assessment (LCA) of drilling mud in arid area : Evaluation of specific fate factors of toxic emissions to groundwater, in: *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production*, 15-17 April, Nice, France. pp. 1–14.

Ghosh, C., Maiti, J., Shafiee, M. and Kumaraswamy, K.G. (2018). Reduction of life cycle costs for a contemporary helicopter through improvement of reliability and maintainability parameters. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management* 35(2), 545–567.

Goldsmith, R., Eriksen, R., Saucier, B. and Deegan, F.J. (2001). Life cycle cost of deepwater production systems, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 30 April-3 May, Houston, Texas. pp. 1–12.

Gomez, Y., Khazaeni, Y., Mohaghegh, S. D. and Gaskari, R. (2009). Top down intelligent reservoir modeling. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 4-7 October, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA.

Gong, X., McVay, D., Bickel, J.E. and Montiel, L.V. (2011). Integrated reservoir and decision modeling to optimize northern Barnett shale development strategies. In: *SPE Canadian Unconventional Resources Conference*, 15-17 November, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Goodwin, S., Carlson, K., Douglas, C. and Knox, K. (2012). Life cycle analysis of water use and intensity of oil and gas recovery in Wattenberg field , Colo. *Oil & Gas Journal* 110(5), 48–59.

Grosse-Sommer, A., Sava, X. and Gilbert, Y.M. (2012). Applying life cycle assessment to evaluate the sustainability of completion fluids, in: *SPE Middle East Health, Safety, Security, and Environment Conference and Exhibition*, 2-4 April, Abu Dhabi, UAE, pp. 1–12.

Guedes, J. and Santos, P. (2016). Valuing an offshore oil exploration and production project through real options analysis. *Energy Economics* 60, 377-386.

- 1 Hammond, R.J. (1966). Convention and limitation in benefit-cost analysis. *Natural Resources Journal*
2 6, 195–222.
- 3 Harding, T.B. (1996). Life cycle value/cost decision making, in: *SPE International Petroleum*
4 *Conference and Exhibition of Mexico*, 5-7 March, Villahermosa, Mexico. pp. 1–10.
- 5 Hegstad, B.K., Tollefsen, S., Arghir, D. V., Cullick, A.S., Narayanan, K., Heath, D.E. and Lever, J.C.
6 (2005). Rapid scenario and risk analysis for a complex gas field with large uncertainties. In: *SPE*
7 *Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 26-29 September, Houston, Texas, USA.
- 8
9
10 Heinze, L.R., Winkler, H.W. and Lea, J.F. (1995). Decision tree for selection of artificial lift method,
11 in: *SPE Production Operations Symposium*, 2-4 April, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, USA, 8
12 pages.
- 13
14 Hernandez, J., Galindo, J.M., Rivera, C.D.P.C. and Salas, C.M. (2013). Life cycle cost analysis for a
15 nitrogen over hydraulic pumping unit, in: *SPE Artificial Lift Conference-Americas*, 21-22 May,
16 Cartagena, Colombia, pp. 234–239.
- 17
18 Huang, J.P., Poh, K.L. and Ang, B.W. (1995). Decision analysis in energy and environmental
19 modeling. *Energy* 20(9), 843–855.
- 20
21 Islam, M. and Powell, D. (2005). Cost-benefit analysis of flowline replacement for a major Middle
22 East oil producer, in: *NACE-International Conference on Corrosion*, 3-7 April, Houston, Texas,
23 USA, pp. 1–19.
- 24
25
26 Iyer, R.R., Grossmann, I.E., Vasantharajan, S. and Cullick, A.S. (1998). Optimal planning and
27 scheduling of offshore oil field infrastructure investment and operations, *Industrial &*
28 *Engineering Chemistry Research* 37, 1380-1397.
- 29
30 Jacquemin, L., Pontalier, P.Y. and Sablayrolles, C. (2012). Life cycle assessment (LCA) applied to
31 the process industry: A review. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 17(8), 1028–
32 1041.
- 33
34
35 Jafarizadeh, B. and Bratvold, R.B. (2009). Real options analysis in petroleum exploration and
36 production: a new paradigm in investment analysis. In: *SPE EUROPEC/EAGE Conference and*
37 *Exhibition*, 8-11 June, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- 38
39 Jentsch Jr, W.A. and Marrs, R.D. (1988). Computerized automation of oilfield production operations:
40 An extensive 5-year study into the costs and benefits. *SPE Production Engineering* 3(3), 299–
41 304.
- 42
43 Jeong, M.S., Cho, J. and Lee, K.S. (2014). Optimized WAG cycle and well pattern of CO₂ EOR
44 projects for maximum NPV in heterogeneous reservoirs, in: *24th International Ocean and Polar*
45 *Engineering Conference*, 15-20 June, Busan, Korea, pp. 152–158.
- 46
47 Johannknecht, F., Gatzen, M.M., Hahn, D. and Lachmayer, R. (2016a). Holistic life cycle costing
48 approach for different development phases of drilling tools state of the art, in: *International*
49 *Petroleum Technology Conference*, 14-16 November, Bangkok, Thailand, pp. 1–11.
- 50
51 Johannknecht, F., Gatzen, M.M. and Lachmayer, R. (2016b). Life cycle cost model for considering
52 fleet utilization in early conceptual design phases. *Procedia CIRP* 48, 68–72.
- 53
54 Joshi, S., Castanier, L.M. and Brigham, W.E. (1998). Techno-economic and risk evaluation of an
55 EOR project, in: *SPE India Oil and Gas Conference and Exhibition*, 17-19 February, New
56 Delhi, India, pp. 633–647.
- 57
58
59 Joshi, S.D. (2003). Cost/benefits of horizontal wells, in: *SPE Western Regional/AAPG Pacific Section*
60
61
62
63
64
65

Joint Meeting, 19-24 May, Long Beach, California. pp. 1–9.

- 1 Kabir, G., Sadiq, R. and Tesfamariam, S. (2014). A review of multi-criteria decision-making methods
2 for infrastructure management. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 10(9), 1176–1210.
- 3 Kaiser, M.J. and Pulsipher, A.G. (2004). A binary choice severance selection model for the removal
4 of offshore structures in the Gulf of Mexico. *Mar. Policy* 28, 97–115.
- 5
6 Kayrbekova, D. and Markeset, T. (2008). Life cycle cost analysis in design of oil and gas production
7 facilities to be used in harsh, remote and sensitive environments, in: *The European Safety and*
8 *Reliability Conference (ESREL)*, 22-25 September, Valencia, Spain, pp. 2955–2961.
- 9
10 Kayrbekova, D. and Markeset, T. (2010). Economic decision support for offshore oil and gas
11 production in arctic conditions: identifying the needs, in: *The European Safety and Reliability*
12 *Conference (ESREL)*, 5-9 September, Rhodes; Greece, pp. 1274–1279.
- 13
14 Kayrbekova, D., Markeset, T. and Ghodrati, B. (2011). Activity-based life cycle cost analysis as an
15 alternative to conventional LCC in engineering design. *International Journal of System*
16 *Assurance Engineering and Management* 2(3), 218–225.
- 17
18 Korn, D.H., Rothermel, T.W., Mansvelt-Beck, F., Guerin-Calvert, M. and Perry, C.W. (1978). The
19 national benefits/costs of enhanced oil recovery research, in: *SPE Eastern Regional Meeting*, 1-3
20 November, Washington, D.C., USA, 8 pages.
- 21
22 Koroma, S.G., Animah, I., Shafiee, M. and Tee, K.F (2018) Decommissioning of deep and ultra-deep
23 water oil and gas pipelines: issues and challenges. *International Journal of Oil, Gas and Coal*
24 *Technology* (in print).
- 25
26 Kullawan, K., Bratvold, R.B. and Bickel, J.E. (2014). Value creation with multi-criteria decision
27 making in geosteering operations, in: *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and Evaluation Symposium*,
28 19-20 May ,Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1–15.
- 29
30 Lassen, T. and Syvertsen, K. (1996). Fatigue reliability and life cycle cost analysis of mooring chains,
31 in: *The Sixth International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference*, 26-31 May, Los
32 Angeles, California, USA, pp. 418–422.
- 33
34 Lev, V. and Murphy, D. (2007). Analysis of multi-criteria decision-making methodologies for the
35 petroleum industry, in: *International Petroleum Technology Conference*, 4-6 December, Dubai,
36 UAE. pp. 1–7.
- 37
38 Li, G., Zhang, D. and Yue, Q. (2009). Life-cycle cost-effective optimum design of ice-resistant
39 offshore platforms. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering* 131(3), 031501, 9
40 pages.
- 41
42 Lilien, J.P., Jin, H. and Gloria, T.P. (2014). Implementation of life cycle assessment at one company:
43 Lessons learned and good practices, in: *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and*
44 *Environment*, 17-19 March, Long Beach, California, USA, pp. 1–8.
- 45
46 Liu, S. and Ford, J. (2008). Cost/benefit analysis of petrophysical data acquisition, in: *49th Annual*
47 *Logging Symposium*, 25-28 May, Austin, Texas, USA, pp. 1–16.
- 48
49 Lopes, Y.G. and Almeida, A.T. de (2013). A multicriteria decision model for selecting a portfolio of
50 oil and gas exploration projects. *Pesquisa Operacional* 33(3), 417–441.
- 51
52 Macmillan, F. (2000). Risk, uncertainty and investment decision-making in the upstream oil and gas
53 industry, PhD Thesis, University of Aberdeen, UK.
- 54
55 Maddah, B., Al-Hindi, M., Yassine, A. and Wahab, Z. (2014). An integrated approach to state
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 decision-making in upstream hydrocarbon operations with application to Lebanon. In: *IEEE*
2 *Transactions on Engineering Management* 61(4), 755–767.

- 3 Marten, C. and Gatzert, M.M. (2014). Decreasing operational cost of high performance oilfield
4 services by lifecycle driven trade-offs in development. *CIRP Annals*, 63(1), 29–32.
- 5 Meade, L.M. and Presley, A. (2002). R&D project selection using the analytic network process. *IEEE*
6 *Transactions on Engineering Management* 49(1), 59–66.
- 7 Methven, J.O. (1993). The Argyll field life cycle with cost control as the operator's ethos, in: *SPE*
8 *Offshore Europe Conference & Exhibition*, 7-10 September, Aberdeen, United Kingdom, pp.
9 167–174.
- 10 Moan, T. (2007). Fatigue reliability of marine structures, from the Alexander Kielland accident to life
11 cycle assessment. *International Journal of Offshore and Polar Engineering* 17(1), 1–21.
- 12 Mohaghegh, S.D. and Khazaeni, Y. (2011). *Application of artificial intelligence in the upstream oil*
13 *and gas industry*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc., New York, 38 pages.
- 14 Mudford, B.S. (2000). Valuing and comparing oil and gas opportunities: A comparison of decision
15 tree and simulation methodologies, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 1-4
16 October 2000, Dallas, Texas. pp. 1–10.
- 17 Nam, K., Chang, D., Chang, K., Rhee, T. and Lee, I.B. (2011). Methodology of life cycle cost with
18 risk expenditure for offshore process at conceptual design stage. *Energy* 36(3), 1554–1563.
- 19 Orimo, Y., Wilde, J. de, Ichimaru, Y., Terashima, T. and Berg, J. van den. (2008). Methodology to
20 determine floating LNG tank capacity by combination of side-by-side down-time simulation and
21 cost/benefit analysis, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 30 April-3 May, Houston, Texas,
22 USA, pp. 130–136.
- 23 Ortiz-Volcan, J.L., Behbahani, F.M. and Akbar, M.G. (2016). Cost optimization of a thermal recovery
24 project in heavy oil green field - Kuwait, in: *SPE Heavy Oil Conference and Exhibition*, 6-8
25 December, Kuwait City, Kuwait, pp. 1–16.
- 26 Ortiz-Volcan, J.L. and Iskandar, R.A. (2011). A life cycle approach for assessing production
27 technologies in heavy oil well construction projects, in: *SPE Heavy Oil Conference and*
28 *Exhibition*, 12-14 December, Kuwait City, Kuwait, pp. 1–12.
- 29 Oruganti, Y., Mittal, R., McBurney, C.J. and Rodriguez Garza, A. (2015). Re-fracturing in Eagle Ford
30 and Bakken to increase reserves and generate incremental NPV: Field Study, in: *SPE Hydraulic*
31 *Fracturing Technology Conference*, The Woodlands, Texas, USA, 20 pages.
- 32 Paula, M.T.R., Labanca, E.L. and Childs, P. (2001). Subsea manifolds design based on life cycle cost,
33 in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 30 April-3 May, Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1–10.
- 34 Pettersen, J.B., Hung, C., Solli, C., Steeneveldt, R., Kerr, S. and Aas, N. (2013). A guide to better
35 wells: environmental life-cycle assessment of historical, current and future best practice in
36 drilling, in: *SPE Offshore Europe Conference & Exhibition*, 3-6 September, Aberdeen, UK. pp.
37 1–9.
- 38 Pierce, T.L. and Wills, G.K. (2013). Multicriteria risk assessment of Permian basin tank-battery
39 facilities using GIS, in: *SPE Americas E&P Health, Safety, Security and Environmental*
40 *Conference*, 18-20 March, Galveston, Texas, USA. pp. 1–22.
- 41 Pinturier, L., Garpestad, E., Moltu, U.E. and Lura, H. (2010). Risk characterisation and effects
42 monitoring used to evaluate cost/environmental benefit of installing improved produced water
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 treatment technology on the Ekofisk field (North Sea), in: *SPE International Conference on*
2 *Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production*, 12-14 April, Rio
3 de Janeiro, Brazil, pp. 1–16.
- 4 Pohekar, S.D. and Ramachandran, M. (2004). Application of multi-criteria decision making to
5 sustainable energy planning - A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 8(4), 365–
6 381.
- 7
8 Poremski, H. (1998). Life cycle assessment - development planning through decommissioning, in:
9 *Offshore Technology Conference*, 4-7 May, Houston, Texas. pp. 1–12.
- 10 Ratnayaka, R.M. and Markeset, T. (2010). Technical integrity management: measures HSE awareness
11 using AHP in selecting a maintenance strategy. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*
12 16(1), 44–63.
- 13 Roosmalen, C.I. Van, Rejimers, J.J., Salza, P. and Wittenberg, L. (1993). Life-cycle design of
14 semisubmersible platforms, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 3-6 May, Houston, Texas. pp.
15 615–625.
- 16 Saaty, T.L. (1980). *The analytical hierarchy process*. McGraw - Hill, New York, USA.
- 17 Saaty, T.L. (1996). Decision making with dependence and feedback. RWS publications, Pittsburgh,
18 USA.
- 19 Sandler, J., Fowler, G., Cheng, K. and Kovscek, A.R. (2014). Solar-generated steam for oil recovery:
20 Reservoir simulation, economic analysis, and life cycle assessment. *Energy Conversion and*
21 *Management* 77, 721–732.
- 22 Sayadi, M.K., Heydari, M. and Shahanaghi, K. (2009). Extension of VIKOR method for decision
23 making problem with interval numbers. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 33(5), 2257–2262.
- 24 Schulze, J.H., Walker, J.N. and Burkholder, M.K. (2012). Integrating the subsurface and the
25 commercial: A new look at monte carlo and decision tree analysis, in: *SPE Hydrocarbon*
26 *Economics and Evaluation Symposium*, 24-25 September, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, pp. 1–11.
- 27 Seo, J.K., Yoon, D., Kim, D. and Kang, K.W. (2016). Point cloud-based erection process method and
28 its application to cost-benefit analysis for modular construction of offshore installations, in: *26th*
29 *International Ocean and Polar Engineering Conference*, 26 June-2 July, Rhodes, Greece, pp.
30 890–895.
- 31 Shafiee, M. (2015a). Maintenance strategy selection problem: an MCDM overview. *Journal of*
32 *Quality in Maintenance Engineering* 21, 378–402.
- 33 Shafiee, M. (2015b). A fuzzy analytic network process model to mitigate the risks associated with
34 offshore wind farms. *Expert Systems with Applications* 42(4), 2143–2152.
- 35 Shafiee, M. and Animah, I. (2017). Life extension decision making of safety critical systems: An
36 overview. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries* 47, 174–188.
- 37 Shafiee, M., Animah, I. and Simms, N. (2016). Development of a techno-economic framework for life
38 extension decision making of safety critical installations. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the*
39 *Process Industries* 44, 299–310.
- 40 Sheremetov, L.B., González-Sánchez, A., López-Yáñez, I. and Ponomarev, A.V. (2013). Time series
41 forecasting: applications to the upstream oil and gas supply chain, *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*
42 46(9), 957-962.
- 43 Shrivastva, C., Al-Mahruqy, S.H., Mjeni, R., Al Kindy, S., Hosein, F., Al-Busaidi, H., Al-Busaidi, J.

- 1 and Laronga, R.J. (2012). Optimising borehole imaging for tight gas exploration: evolving a go -
2 no go decision tree in tight gas reservoirs of the sultanate of Oman, in: *SPE Middle East*
3 *Unconventional Gas Conference and Exhibition*, 23-25 January, Abu Dhabi, UAE, pp. 1–11.
- 4 Silitonga, Y.P. (2015). Real options method vs discounted cash flow method to analyze upstream oil
5 & gas projects. *PM World Journal* Vol. IV, Issue VII, 26 pages.
- 6
- 7 Silva, V.B.S., Morais, D.C. and Almeida, A.T. (2010). A multicriteria group decision model to
8 support watershed committees in Brazil. *Water Resources Management* 24(14), 4075–4091.
- 9
- 10 Siveter, R., Castañeda, J., Emmert, A., Lee, A., Martin Juez, J., Stephenson, T., Riera-Palou, X.,
11 Ritter, K., Smith, G.R. and Verduzco, L. (2014). The expanding role of natural gas: Comparing
12 life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions, in: *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and*
13 *Environment*, 17-19 March, Long Beach, California, USA, pp. 1–9.
- 14
- 15 Smith, L.M. and Celant, M. (1995). Life cycle costing - are duplex stainless steel pipelines the cost-
16 effective choice?, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 1-4 May, Houston, Texas, USA, 8
17 pages.
- 18
- 19
- 20 Smith, S.J., Tweedie, A.A.P. and Gallivan, J.D. (1997). Evaluating the performance of multi-lateral
21 producing wells: cost benefits and potential risks, in: *Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum*
22 *Engineering Conference*, 30 August-3 September, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. pp. 1–21.
- 23
- 24 Songhurst, B.W. and Kingsley, M. (1993). Life-cycle cost reduction through designing for
25 maintenance, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 3-6 May, Houston, Texas, pp. 537–546.
- 26
- 27 Sprowso, M.E., Pugh, P. and Nekhom, M. (1979). Decision tree analysis of exploration activities, in:
28 *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and Evaluation Symposium*, 11-13 February, Dallas, Texas, USA,
29 8 pages.
- 30
- 31
- 32 Stephenson, T., Valle, J.E. and Riera-Palou, X. (2011). Modeling the relative GHG emissions of
33 conventional and shale gas production. *Environmental Science & Technology* 45(24), 10757–
34 10764.
- 35
- 36 Steuten, B. and Onna, M. van. (2016). Reduce project and life cycle cost with TCP flowline, in:
37 *Offshore Technology Conference Asia*, 22-25 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–10.
- 38
- 39 Strantzali, E. and Aravossis, K. (2016). Decision making in renewable energy investments: A review.
40 *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 55, 885–898.
- 41
- 42 Streeter, J. and Moody, R. (2011). Improved NPV using shallow water subsea systems to achieve
43 early first oil and reduce CAPEX, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Brasil*, 4-6 October, Rio
44 de Janeiro, Brazil, pp. 1–9.
- 45
- 46 Suslick, S.B. and Furtado, R. (2001). Quantifying the value of technological, environmental and
47 financial gain in decision models for offshore oil exploration. *Journal of Petroleum Science and*
48 *Engineering* 32(2-4), 115–125.
- 49
- 50 Suslick, S.B., Furtado, R. and Nepomuceno, F. (2001). Integrating technological and financial
51 uncertainty for offshore oil exploration: an application of multiobjective decision analysis, in:
52 *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and Evaluation Symposium*, 2-3 April, Dallas, Texas, USA, pp. 1–
53 9.
- 54
- 55
- 56 Tague, J.R. and Hollman, G.F. (2000). Downhole video: A cost/benefit analysis, in: *SPE/AAPG*
57 *Western Regional Meeting*, 19-22 June, Long Beach, California. pp. 1–6.
- 58
- 59 Thoft-christensen, P. (2008). Modelling user costs in life-cycle cost-benefit (LCCB) analysis, in: *The*
60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- IFIP International Conference on Reliability and Optimization of Structural Systems*, August 6-9, Mexico City, Mexico, pp. 1–10.
- Thoft-Christensen, P. (2012). Infrastructures and life-cycle cost-benefit analysis. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 8(5), 507–516.
- Trujillo, J.A., Rincon Rojas, R. and Jimenez Carreno, L. (2013). Insertion problems in tandem progressing cavity (PC) pumps, solving this on a decision tree, in: *SPE Artificial Lift Conference-Americas*, 21-22 May, Cartagena, Colombia, pp. 1–8.
- Verre, F., Giubileo, A. and Cadegiani, C. (2009). Asset life-cycle opex modelling with montecarlo simulation to reduce uncertainties and to improve field exploitation, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 4-7 October, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, pp. 1–6.
- Vinodh, S. and Jeya Girubha, R. (2012). PROMETHEE based sustainable concept selection. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 36(11), 5301–5308.
- Virine, L. (2008). Judgment elicitation process for multi-criteria decision-Making in oil and gas industry, in: *International Petroleum Technology Conference*, 3-5 December, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. pp. 1–8.
- Vorarat, S., Al-hajj, A. and Robert, T. (2004). Developing a model to suit life cycle costing analysis for assets in the oil and gas industry, in: *SPE Asia Pacific Conference on Integrated Modelling for Asset Management*, 29-30 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–5.
- Weber, C.L. and Clavin, C. (2012). Life cycle carbon footprint of shale gas: review of evidence and implications. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46(11), 5688–5695.
- Winkel, J.D. (1996). Use of life cycle costing in new and mature applications, in: *SPE European Production Operations Conference and Exhibition*, 16-17 April, Stavanger, Norway, pp. 239–242.
- World Energy Council (2017). *World Energy Issues Monitor 2017*. www.worldenergy.org, pp. 1–150.
- Wright, J.R., Arim, K.A. and Kennedy, S. (2014). A case study detailing the design, planning, installation and cost and environmental benefit analysis of a reinforced thermoplastic pipe pulled through the inside of an existing offshore steel flow line in the east Malaysia Samarang field, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Asia*, 25-28 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. pp. 1–7.
- Zadeh, L.A. (1965) Fuzzy sets. *Information Control* 8, 338–353.
- Zavala-Araiza, D., Allen, D.T., Harrison, M., George, F.C. and Jersey, G.R. (2015). Allocating methane emissions to natural gas and oil production from shale formations. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering* 3(3), 492–498.
- Zeleny, M. and Cochrane, J. (1982). *Multiple criteria decision making*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Zhu, D. and Arcos, D. (2008). Technical, economic and risk analysis for a multilateral well, in: *SPE Russian Oil and Gas Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 28-30 October, Moscow, Russia, pp. 1–17.
- Zio, E. (1996). On the use of the analytic hierarchy process in the aggregation of expert judgments. *Reliability Engineering and Systems Safety* 53, 127–138.
- Zoveidavianpoor, M., Samsuri, A. and Shadizadeh, S.R. (2012). Fuzzy logic in candidate-well selection for hydraulic fracturing in oil and gas wells: A critical review. *International Journal of Physical Sciences* 7(26), 4049-4060.

Decision Support Methods and Applications in the Upstream Oil and Gas Sector

Mahmood Shafiee ^{1*}, Isaac Animah ¹, Babakalli Alkali ², David Baglee ³

¹ School of Energy and Power, Cranfield University, Bedfordshire MK43 0AL, UK

² School of Engineering and Built Environment, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, UK

³ Faculty of Engineering and Advanced Manufacturing, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, UK

* Corresponding author, Tel: +44 1234 750111 ; Email: m.shafiee@cranfield.ac.uk

Abstract

Decision-making support (DMS) methods are widely used for technical, economic, social and environmental assessments within different energy sectors, including upstream oil and gas, refining and distribution, petrochemical, power generation, nuclear power, solar, biofuels, and wind. The main aim of this paper is to present a comprehensive literature review and classification framework for the latest scholarly research on the application of DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas industry. To achieve this aim, a systematic review is conducted on the current state-of-the-art and future perspectives of various DMS methods applied to different upstream operations (such as exploration, development and production) which take place prior to shipping of crude oil and natural gas to the refineries for processing. Journal and conference proceeding sources that contain literature on the subject are identified, and based on a set of inclusion criteria the related papers are selected and reviewed carefully. A framework is then proposed to classify the literature according to the year and source of publications, type of fossil fuel sources, oil and gas field's lifecycle phases, data collection techniques, decision-making methods, and geographical distribution and location of case studies. The proposed literature classification and content analysis can help upstream oil and gas industry stakeholders such as field owners, asset managers, service providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies to gain better insight about their business activities with well-informed decision-making processes.

Keywords

Decision-making; Asset management; Decision support system (DSS); Upstream Oil and gas.

1. Introduction

Despite the unprecedented increase in the use of renewables - wind, solar, biofuels, hydro, waste, geothermal and tidal energy - to support electricity generation in the last decade, many countries still produce significant amount of energy from burning fossil fuels, mainly crude oil, coal, and natural gas. According to a recent report published by the [World Energy Council \(2017\)](#), oil remains the world's leading fuel, accounting for about one-third of global energy consumption, followed by coal and natural gas with around %29 and %24 respectively. The oil and gas industry is divided into three major sectors of upstream, midstream, and downstream. The upstream sector is the most capital-intensive and important segment of the three in the oil and gas business, as this is where crude oil and natural gas are produced. The upstream oil and gas includes all activities related to the exploration and extraction of crude oil and natural gas which take place prior to shipping products to the refineries for processing.

Over the past four decades, the upstream oil and gas industries have applied various ways of well-informed business decision-making to increase production volume, reduce costs, improve safety, enhance operational performance, and protect the environment. Many of the decision-making problems in upstream oil and gas sector are complex in nature, involve uncertainties and risks, and require significant input from practitioners and policy-makers. The concept of decision analysis was first applied in the 1960s to solve oil and gas 'exploration' problems in the upstream sector ([Huang et al., 1995](#)). Since then, the concept has been used in decision-making for a number of other important areas such as field development, production, maintenance of wells and facilities, life extension and decommissioning, etc. ([Animah and Shafiee, 2018](#)).

In recent years, a spectrum of qualitative and quantitative decision-making support (DMS) methods has been proposed in the literature to assist stakeholders in the upstream oil and gas sector to better understand reservoir characteristics, simulate field operations, develop low carbon production technologies, and make justifiable business decisions regarding exploration and development of both green and brown fields. As stated in [Bratvold et al. \(2009\)](#), DMS methods can help practitioners not only in performing technical and diagnostic tests of equipment but also in complying with regulatory and risk management requirements. Typical DMS methods used within the upstream sector include: operational research methods such as linear programming, integer programming, and goal programming; economic analysis methods such as cost-benefit analysis (CBA), real options analysis (ROA), and life cycle costing (LCC); statistical methods such as probabilistic approaches, simulation-based methods, and decision tree analysis (DTA); and environmental assessment methods such as environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA).

[Strantzali and Aravossis \(2016\)](#) indicated that the use of single-criterion approaches have historically dominated decision-making in the upstream oil and gas sector. However, given

1 the complexity and conflicting interests of involved actors in the decision making process, the
2 use of multi-criteria evaluation techniques is gaining momentum. Such techniques are able to
3 consider simultaneously multiple attributes of different decision-making problems in the
4 upstream sector (such as selecting the best drilling techniques and vessels, choosing the most
5 appropriate maintenance strategies for different systems and components on oil and gas
6 platforms, determining the most environmentally friendly end-of-life strategies for wells,
7 identifying the most viable decommissioning processes for facilities, etc.). Moreover, in order
8 to account for uncertainties associated with practitioners' subjective perception and
9 experience in decision-making, soft computing methods such as fuzzy set theory, rough set
10 theory, artificial intelligence (AI), and neural networks (NN) are increasingly becoming
11 popular.
12

13
14
15
16
17 Despite the growing use of decision analytics approaches in upstream, midstream, and
18 downstream oil and gas sectors in recent years, the literature on classification of the methods
19 employed to support the decision-making processes in these sectors has been very limited
20 (Deore, 2012). This paper aims to conduct a systematic review on the current state-of-the-art
21 and future perspectives of the application of various DMS methods in the upstream oil and
22 gas industry. The review is based on an exhaustive assessment of the studies identified in
23 relation to the topic, including scholarly articles in refereed academic journals and conference
24 proceedings between the years 1977 and 2016. A framework is also proposed to classify the
25 literature according to the year and source of publication, type of fossil fuel source, oil and
26 gas field development phase, data collection technique, decision-making method, and
27 geographical location of the case studies. The findings of this review can be very useful to
28 upstream oil and gas industry stakeholders, including field owners, asset managers, service
29 providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies to gain
30 current state-of-the-art knowledge about well-informed decision-making, find out how to
31 determine the most effective DMS method for each problem, and to identify real-life
32 applications and case studies.
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 The structure of the paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), the most commonly used
44 decision-making support methods in the oil and gas industry, and in particular the upstream
45 sector, are introduced. The review methodology as well as the classification framework are
46 presented in [Section 3](#), and the observation and findings of the classification process are
47 reported in details in [Section 4](#). Finally, the concluding remarks and future research directions
48 are given in [Section 5](#).
49
50
51

52 **2. Decision-making support (DMS) methods**

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS), decision tree analysis (DTA), multi-criteria decision analysis
2 (MCDA), fuzzy logic analysis (FLA) and artificial intelligence (AI). In what follows, a brief
3 description of these methods and their application to the upstream sector are presented.
4

5 *2.1 Operational research (OR)*

6
7 OR models include a model representing the logical and mathematical relationships between
8 variables, an objective function with which alternative solutions are evaluated, and
9 constraints that restrict solutions to feasible values. This mathematical model can be either a
10 linear programming (LP) or a non-linear programming (NLP) problem. In LP, all objectives
11 and constraints are linear functions, however, in NLP, at least one of constraints or the
12 objective function is a non-linear function. The decision variables of an OR model can be
13 continuous, or integer, or a mixture of both. Integer programming (LP) is a model whose all
14 variables are constrained to take integer values, whereas in mixed-integer programming
15 (MIP) only some of the decision variables are required to have integer values.
16
17

18 Goal programming (GP) is a relatively new OR model that has been proposed as an
19 approach for the analysis of problems involving multiple, conflicting objectives. The basic
20 approach of GP is to specify an aspiration level for each of the objectives and then seek a
21 solution that minimizes the weighted sum of deviations of these objective functions from
22 their respective goals. GP problems, depending on the type of their mathematical model, can
23 be solved by either LP, NLP, IP or MILP.
24
25

26 *2.2 Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)*

27
28 CBA concept offers decision-makers the opportunity to evaluate the economic viability of
29 different technologies, projects and policies. A key strength of this approach is that it
30 provides results that are compatible to market mechanisms. CBA evaluation process involves
31 summing up the equivalent money value of present costs of a project or policy and compare
32 the result with the present value of benefits in order to ascertain if the project or policy is
33 worthwhile. A project or policy is considered beneficial if the sum of its benefits becomes
34 greater than the sum of its costs or when the benefit to cost ratio is greater than one.
35
36

37 *2.3 Real options analysis (ROA)*

38
39 One of the limitations of the CBA approach is that not all costs or benefits (e.g. cost of
40 human injury/death) of a project or policy can be expressed in monetary equivalents
41 (Hammond, 1966). For this reason, those decision-making outcomes that cannot be easily
42 assigned a monetary value may introduce a level of uncertainty into cost or benefit
43 calculations, hence restricting the applicability of the CBA method. ROA, also termed as real
44 options valuation (ROV), is an extension of CBA approach that can be used for evaluating
45 the value of options associated with a decision under uncertainty. The tool can help
46 stakeholders decide on investments that might be delayed, expanded, abandoned, or
47 repositioned. ROA is useful for the analysis of investment projects in the upstream sector,
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 such as the development of oil fields (Jafarizadeh and Bratvold, 2009; Silitonga, 2015). Oil
2 field development projects are an example of multiyear investment that is subject to many
3 uncertainties during the whole lifetime of the project. The ROA approach involves the
4 following steps: (1) create the structure for the problem, (2) develop a model of the decisions,
5 uncertainties, and outcomes over time, (3) gather data for estimating outcome values in each
6 scenario, and (4) perform analysis comparing alternatives and identifying action plans.
7
8

9 10 *2.4 Life cycle costing (LCC)*

11 The LCC analysis concept was originally introduced by the U.S. Department of Defence
12 (DoD) in the 1970s (Ghosh *et al.*, 2018) to assist stakeholders and decision makers in
13 conducting systematic assessment of costs of a project or policy. Since then, it has been
14 applied to a wide variety of projects in different industries including oil and gas energy
15 (Fuller and Peterson, 1996). This approach has helped upstream oil and gas stakeholders
16 improve systems/components design, prioritize capital-intensive exploration activities,
17 support comparative assessment of two or more investment projects, optimize operation and
18 maintenance (O&M) strategies, determine whether life-extension is a viable consideration
19 when production equipment reach end of their lives, etc.
20
21

22 In contrast to CBA, the LCC method calculates all direct costs associated with a project
23 or a policy without taking indirect costs (or benefits) into account. The evaluation process
24 involves the summation of discounted cash flows that accrue cost elements over the life cycle
25 of a project/asset/policy with an appropriate discount rate. Over the last few years, the LCC
26 method has evolved with life cycle cost-benefit (LCCB) and activity-based life cycle costing
27 (AB-LCC) analysis approaches (for more see Thoft-Christensen, 2012; Animah *et al.*, 2018).
28 The disadvantage of the LCC approach is similar to those associated with the CBA method.
29 Thoft-christensen (2008) indicated the high discount rate set by different countries may
30 render this approach inaccurate.
31
32

33 34 *2.5 Environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA)*

35 ELCA is a holistic and integrated approach for overall assessment of environmental
36 compatibility of a project, policy, an activity or a product over its whole life cycle. The
37 ELCA of a product comprises a “cradle-to-grave” assessment by considering the
38 environmental consequences of various phases of the product life cycle, including: raw
39 material acquisition phase, design/development phase, manufacturing phase, distribution
40 phase, O&M phase, and end-of-life phase (Jacquemin *et al.*, 2012).
41
42

43 Conducting a ELCA study in the upstream oil and gas industry can help field owners
44 better understand the material usage as well as environmental performance (such as emission
45 of greenhouse gases, including CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, H₂S, etc.) of various upstream operations
46 (exploration and production). For more details on ELCA applications in the upstream oil and
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 gas sector, readers can refer to the following references: [Aycaguer et al. \(2001\)](#); [Goodwin et](#)
2 [al. \(2012\)](#); [Garg et al. \(2013\)](#).

3 4 2.6 Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS)

5 MCS is a computerized mathematical method that relies on repeated random sampling and
6 statistical analysis to obtain numerical results. In this method, the likelihood of occurrence of
7 events are sampled at random from a probability distribution which is chosen based upon the
8 type of problem under investigation. Each discrete sample set is referred to as an iteration and
9 the resulting outcome from the calculations for that sample is recorded. This process will be
10 repeated hundreds or thousands of times to obtain an estimate of mean probability of
11 occurrence of the event. The accuracy of the estimate is dependent on the number of
12 iterations performed. MCS has been vastly used in many applications within the upstream oil
13 and gas. The applications include risk assessment, reservoir evaluation, hydraulic fracturing of
14 wells, and enhanced recovery processes ([Macmillan, 2000](#)).

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.7 Decision Tree analysis (DTA)

23 DTA uses graphical models to represent the sequence of decisions, events and their
24 anticipated outcomes ([Dey, 2002](#)). The analysis is structured in a form of a tree with branches
25 representing the possible action-event combinations. The conditional payoffs are obtained for
26 each decision by considering various action-event combinations. The DTA method is
27 appropriate when decision-making procedures are multi-stage, e.g. when an event takes place
28 over a sequence of stages. This makes the DTA method logically structured and suitable for
29 decision-making problems ([Dey, 2012](#)). According to [Cheldi et al. \(1997\)](#), DTA is used in the
30 oil and gas industry mainly for quantitative risk assessment. One important feature of the
31 DTA method is the calculation of expected monetary value (EMV), which is used as the basis
32 to compare different decision options and choose the best one.

33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 2.8 Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA)

42 MCDA method is one of the popular and commonly used DMS methods in the oil and gas
43 energy industry. This method is increasingly becoming popular for decision-making in the
44 upstream sector because the conventional single-criterion decision-making approaches cannot
45 deliver appropriate results considering the complexity of field exploration and development
46 activities. The MCDA method provides a flexible approach to solve complex problems with
47 multiple attributes (e.g. technical, economic, social, legal and environmental) by helping
48 stakeholders to make clear and consistent decisions.

49 Up to date, several MCDA methods have been developed for solving complex decision-
50 making problems in the oil and gas industry. The most widely used MCDA methods include:
51 Weighted Sum Model (WSM), Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), Analytic Network Process
52 (ANP), Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT), Technique for Order of Preference by
53 Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS), Preference Ranking Organization Method Of
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Enrichment Evaluation (PROMETHEE), Elimination and Choice Expressing Reality (ELECTRE), Vlsekriterijumska Optimizacija I KOmpromisno Resenje (VIKOR). A brief discussion of each of these methods, with an attempt to highlight advantages and disadvantages, follows.

2.8.1 *Weighted sum model (WSM)*

This is the best known and simplest MCDA method (Shafiee, 2015a). WSM is also referred to as the simple additive weighting (SAW) in the literature as it is suitable for handling single dimensional problems. The fundamental principle behind this method is to determine weighted sum of rating for each alternative considered in decision analysis. According to Kabir *et al.* (2014), to apply WSM correctly, all criteria should be single dimensional, i.e. cost-type or benefit-type. For this reason, Caterino *et al.* (2009) suggested that WSM is not efficient for solving complex decision-making problems which involve different types of criteria and decision variables.

2.8.2 *Analytic hierarchy process (AHP)*

The analytical hierarchy process (AHP) was developed by Saaty (1980) and since then this method has been applied to solve complex problems in various industries including oil and gas. The method helps decision makers to break down complex decision-making problems into hierarchical structure with goal at the top, followed by criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives (Zio, 1996). In AHP, to select the best alternative, decision-maker performs pairwise comparison of evaluation criteria and alternatives and then test the consistency of the pairwise comparison by computing an index called consistency ratio (CR). The weight for pairwise comparison is obtained using Saaty's fundamental scale of 1-9, where 1 indicates equal importance, 3 moderate importance, 5 strong importance, 7 very strong importance, and 9 indicates extreme importance. The values of 2, 4, 6, and 8 are assigned to indicate compromise values of importance.

2.8.3 *Analytic network process (ANP)*

The analytical network process (ANP) is a generalized form of the AHP method, but the difference is that in contrast to AHP, the basic structures of ANP are networks. This is because AHP has been criticized for structuring the decision-making problems in hierarchical manner (Meade and Presley, 2002; Shafiee, 2015b). Also, Saaty (1996) suggested the use of ANP for solving the problems in which there is dependence between alternatives or criteria.

2.8.4 *Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT)*

This MCDA method takes into account the decision makers' preferences as a utility function for a set of possible attributes associated with alternatives. The best alternative is the one that maximizes the decision-makers' expected utility function. With respect to single attribute

1 utility, the utility function can either be separated additively or multiplicatively (Pohekar and
2 Ramachandran, 2004).

3 4 2.8.5 Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)

5 TOPSIS is a useful MCDA method for ranking and selection of alternatives based on distance
6 measures. The basic concept of this method is that the selected alternative should have the
7 shortest geometric distance from the positive ideal solution and the longest geometric
8 distance from the negative ideal solution. The TOPSIS method ranks alternatives in
9 ascending or descending order of preference, which makes it easier to identify the best
10 solution. Thus, decision makers' preference order of alternatives is obtained through
11 comparison of Euclidean distances (Pohekar and Ramachandran, 2004).

12 13 14 15 16 17 2.8.6 Preference Ranking Organization Method Of Enrichment Evaluation (PROMETHEE)

18 PROMETHEE was developed by Brans and Vincke (1985) to outrank a set of finite
19 alternatives with respect to conflicting criteria and then select the best alternative. The
20 PROMETHEE method uses positive and negative preference flows for different alternatives
21 in order to produce ranking in relation to decision weights (Kabir et al., 2014). There are
22 different methods of PROMETHEE described in the literature, including PROMETHEE I
23 (partial ranking), PROMETHEE II (complete ranking), PROMETHEE III (ranking based on
24 intervals), PROMETHEE IV (continuous case), PROMETHEE V (PROMETHEE II and
25 integer linear programming), PROMETHEE VI (weights of criteria are intervals) and
26 PROMETHEE GAIA (graphical representation of PROMETHEE) (Silva et al., 2010). The
27 most popular and commonly used techniques among the family of PROMETHEE methods
28 include PROMETHEE I and PROMETHEE II & II (Emovon et al., 2018). According to
29 Vinodh and Jeya Girubha (2012) PROMETHEE II is applied to rank alternatives because it
30 establishes a complete ranking or pre-order of alternatives.

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 2.8.7 Elimination and Choice Expressing Reality (ELECTRE)

42 ELECTRE uses an indirect method to rank alternatives by means of pair comparison under
43 each criteria (Cheng et al., 2002). Several versions of the ELECTRE method have been
44 developed since its conception in the mid-1960s (Kabir et al., 2014), with ELECTRE TRI
45 and ELECTRE III being the most popular and commonly used methods among the family of
46 ELECTRE methods. One of the key strength of ELECTRE is its applicability even when
47 there is missing information.

48 49 50 51 52 53 2.8.8 Vlsekriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje (VIKOR)

54 VIKOR is a compromising MCDA method that determines compromise ranking of
55 alternatives (Zeleny and Cochrane, 1982). The main objective of using this method is to
56 select a suitable alternative that is possibly close to the ideal solution. It introduces a multi-
57 criteria ranking index based on the particular measure of 'closeness' to the 'ideal' solution
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(Sayadi *et al.*, 2009). The distance measure used in the VIKOR method is a family of L_p -metrics that is used as an aggregation function in a compromise programming.

2.9 Fuzzy logic analysis (FLA)

FLA is a powerful methodology which was introduced by Zadeh (1965) to deal with uncertainties in human judgments during decision-making. In FLA, fuzzy sets rather than crisp sets are used to determine the membership of a variable. Fuzzy sets are often presented by linguistic terms such as ‘low temperature’, ‘high pressure’, etc. In general, the output of a FLA is a fuzzy set expressed as a distribution of possibilities. FLA has been successfully applied in many different areas of upstream oil and gas sector, including reservoir characterization, drilling, permeability and rock type estimation, petroleum separation, and hydraulic fracturing (see Zoveidavianpoor *et al.*, 2012).

2.10 Artificial intelligence (AI)

AI is defined as the theory and development of computer systems able to support decision-making processes that normally require human intelligence. In other words, AI is the use of computer algorithms to attempt to replicate the human ability to learn, reason and make decisions. AI includes a wide range of techniques such as artificial neural networks (ANN), generic algorithm (GA), support vector machine (SVM), etc. Applications of AI tools in various operations of the upstream oil and gas sector can be found in the literature (see Mohaghegh and Khazaeni, 2011). For instance, for drilling decision-making the readers can refer to Bello *et al.* (2016), and for further details about oil production forecasting the readers are recommended to read Sheremetov *et al.* (2013).

2.11 Hybrid decision analysis methods

Hybrid decision analysis methods such as hybrid MCDA methods, combined MCDA and fuzzy logic methods, etc. are a powerful group of DMS methods which can assist decision-makers in handling miscellaneous information, divergence in stakeholders’ preferences, interconnected or contradicting criteria, and uncertain environments (Dinmohammadi and Shafiee, 2017).

2.11.1 Hybrid MCDA methods

Majority of the classical MCDA methods have practical limitations. In order to improve their strengths and eliminate their weaknesses, some hybrid MCDA models have been developed in the literature, e.g. SWM-AHP, ANP-TOPSIS. A hybrid MCDA method is an effective decision-making method which involves the integration of two or more appropriate MCDA methods for solving complex and multi-attribute problems. By this integration, limitations of one method can be offset by strengths of the other method.

2.11.2 Combined MCDA and fuzzy logic method

1 MCDA methods can be categorized into two types of crisp and fuzzy models (Shafiee,
2 2015a). The crisp MCDA models express the importance weights of criteria using crisp
3 numbers. However, it is sometimes difficult to provide precise numerical values for
4 evaluation criteria due to the uncertainty and vagueness in real-life decision-making
5 processes. The fuzzy MCDA models express the preferences of relative importance between
6 criteria by linguistic terms and then set them into fuzzy numbers such as triangular or
7 trapezoidal fuzzy numbers. A triangular fuzzy number is a fuzzy number whose membership
8 function is defined by three real numbers, expressed as (l, m, u) , where the function is first
9 linearly increasing from point $[l, 0]$ to $[m, 1]$ and then linearly decreasing to $[u, 0]$. m is called
10 the modal value, and l and u denote the right and left boundary respectively.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 3. Review methodology and classification framework

18 In order to identify the available literature regarding the application of different DMS
19 methods in the upstream oil and gas industry, a systematic review was conducted. The
20 literature review covered all the studies published by scholars and practitioners throughout
21 the world in relevant journals and conference proceedings in English language between the
22 years 1977 and 2016.
23
24
25
26

27 The literature was identified from different databases such as Scopus, Web of Science,
28 Onepetrol, Knovel, IEEE Xplore, American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) digital
29 collection and Google scholar, and the related articles were selected based on a set of
30 inclusion criteria. The above indexing databases were selected due to their broad coverage of
31 scientific peer-reviewed journal articles as well as conference papers. Several keywords and
32 phrases such as “decision-making”, “upstream petroleum”, “oil and gas”, “decision analysis”,
33 “methods”, “techniques” in different combinations were used to identify the existing
34 literature. The keyword search resulted in a total of 129 papers. The title and abstract of each
35 paper were then reviewed to assess their relevance to the topic. After reviewing the titles and
36 abstracts, 19 papers were discarded due to their irrelevance to the subject area and eventually,
37 110 papers were selected for inclusion in this study. These papers are: Korn *et al.* (1978);
38 Sprowso *et al.* (1979); Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988); Balen *et al.* (1988); Methven (1993);
39 Roosmalen *et al.* (1993); Songhurst and Kingsley (1993); Dear *et al.* (1995); Heinze *et al.*
40 (1995); Smith and Celant (1995); Lassen and Syvertsen (1996); Harding (1996); Winkel
41 (1996); Cheldi *et al.* (1997); Smith *et al.* (1997); Iyer *et al.* (1998); Joshi *et al.* (1998);
42 Poremski (1998); Denney (1999); Gatta (1999); Mudford (2000); Tague and Hollman (2000);
43 Aycaguer *et al.* (2001); Erdogan *et al.* (2001); Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001); Goldsmith
44 *et al.* (2001); Paula *et al.* (2001); Suslick and Furtado (2001); Suslick *et al.* (2001); Begg *et*
45 *al.* (2002); Castro *et al.* (2002); Denney (2002); Finch *et al.* (2002); Balch *et al.* (2003);
46 Cullick *et al.* (2003); El-Reedy (2003); Joshi (2003); Chitwood *et al.* (2004); Ferreira *et al.*
47 (2004); Vorarat *et al.* (2004); Hegstad *et al.* (2005); Islam and Powell (2005); Brainard
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (2006); Cullick *et al.* (2007); Lev and Murphy (2007); Moan (2007); Bahmannia (2008);
2 Ghazi *et al.* (2008); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2008); Liu and Ford (2008); Orimo *et al.*
3 (2008); Virine (2008); Zhu and Arcos (2008); Abhulimen (2009); Bybee (2009); Gomez *et al.*
4 *et al.* (2009); Jafarizadeh and Bratvold (2009); Li *et al.* (2009); Verre *et al.* (2009); Kayrbekova
5 and Markeset (2010); Ratnayaka and Markeset (2010); Pinturier *et al.* (2010); Angert *et al.*
6 (2011); Chen *et al.* (2011); Gong *et al.* (2011); Kayrbekova *et al.* (2011); Nam *et al.* (2011);
7 Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011); Stephenson *et al.* (2011); Streeter and Moody (2011);
8 Burnham *et al.* (2012); Goodwin *et al.* (2012); Grosse-Sommer *et al.* (2012); Schulze *et al.*
9 (2012); Shrivastva *et al.* (2012); Weber and Clavin (2012); Zoveidavianpoor *et al.* (2012);
10 Burlini and Araruna (2013); Hernandez *et al.* (2013); Lopes and Almeida (2013); Pettersen *et al.*
11 *et al.* (2013); Pierce and Wills (2013); Sheremetov *et al.* (2013); Trujillo *et al.* (2013);
12 Fergestad *et al.* (2014); Fowler *et al.* (2014); Jeong *et al.* (2014); Kullawan *et al.* (2014);
13 Lilien *et al.* (2014); Maddah *et al.* (2014); Marten and Gatzen (2014); Sandler *et al.* (2014);
14 Siveter *et al.* (2014); Wright *et al.* (2014); Chilukuri *et al.* (2015); Chun *et al.* (2015); de
15 Wardt and Peterson (2015); Ghani *et al.* (2015); Oruganti *et al.* (2015); Silitonga (2015);
16 Zavala-Araiza *et al.* (2015); Adam and Ghosh (2016); Bello *et al.* (2016); Guedes and Santos
17 (2016); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016a); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016b); Ortiz-Volcan *et al.* (2016);
18 Seo *et al.* (2016); Shafiee *et al.* (2016); Steuten and Onna (2016).

19 The full text of each paper was reviewed carefully and a classification framework was
20 presented to categorize the existing literature. As shown in Figure 1, the state-of-the-art of
21 methods used to support decision-making in the upstream oil and gas industry can be
22 classified according to the following attributes:

23 ****Figure 1****

24 **Figure 1.** Classification framework for decision-making support methods applied to the upstream oil
25 and gas sector.

- 26 • Year of publications (1977–1986, 1987–1996, 1997–2006, 2007–2016);
- 27 • Distribution of publications (type of publication, source of publication);
- 28 • Types of fossil fuel sources (conventional, non-conventional);
- 29 • Oil and gas field’s lifecycle phases (exploration, development, production, life
30 extension, abandonment/decommission);
- 31 • Data collection techniques (survey, direct measurement or observation, monitoring
32 and data acquisition systems, others);
- 33 • Decision support methods (OR, CBA, ROA, LCC, ELCA, MCS, DTA, MCDA, FLA,
34 AI, and Hybrid methods);
- 35 • Geographical distribution of case studies and their locations (Asia, South America,
36 North America, Europe, Africa).

4. Review findings and classification results

In this section, the observation and findings of the review classification process are reported in details.

4.1 Distribution of studies based on year of publication

We divided the period of study into four equal decades of ten years each—1977 to 1986, 1987 to 1996, 1997 to 2006, and 2007 to 2016. [Figure 2](#) depicts a bar chart representing the number of papers published about the application of DMS methods to upstream oil and gas operations during the past four decades.

**** Figure 2****

Figure 2. The number of publications during the past four decades.

As can be seen, there is a significant increase in the number of papers over the period of study. However, more than 60 percent of the studies have been published in the past ten years (2007-2016), which implies the increasing importance and usefulness of DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas sector.

4.2 Distribution of studies based on type of source of publications

Out of the 110 identified papers, there were thirty-two journal articles (~ 29%) (Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988); Dear *et al.* (1995); Iyer *et al.* (1998); Denney (1999); Aycaguer *et al.* (2001); Suslick and Furtado (2001); Denney (2002); Finch *et al.* (2002); Ferreira *et al.* (2004); Moan (2007); Bybee (2009); Li *et al.* (2009); Ratnayaka and Markeset (2010); Kayrbekova *et al.* (2011); Nam *et al.* (2011); Stephenson *et al.* (2011); Burnham *et al.* (2012); Goodwin *et al.* (2012); Weber and Clavin (2012); Zoveidavianpoor *et al.* (2012); Lopes and Almeida (2013); Sheremetov *et al.* (2013); Fowler *et al.* (2014); Maddah *et al.* (2014); Marten and Gatzen (2014); Sandler *et al.* (2014); Ghani *et al.* (2015); Silitonga (2015); Zavala-Araiza *et al.* (2015); Guedes and Santos (2016); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016b); Shafiee *et al.* (2016)) and seventy-eight conference papers (~ 71%) (Korn *et al.* (1978); Sprowso *et al.* (1979); Balen *et al.* (1988); Methven (1993); Roosmalen *et al.* (1993); Songhurst and Kingsley (1993); Heinze *et al.* (1995); Smith and Celant (1995); Lassen and Syvertsen (1996); Harding (1996); Winkel (1996); Cheldi *et al.* (1997); Smith *et al.* (1997); Joshi *et al.* (1998); Poremski (1998); Gatta (1999); Mudford (2000); Tague and Hollman (2000); Erdogan *et al.* (2001); Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001); Goldsmith *et al.* (2001); Paula *et al.* (2001); Suslick *et al.* (2001); Begg *et al.* (2002); Castro *et al.* (2002); Balch *et al.* (2003); Cullick *et al.* (2003); El-Reedy (2003); Joshi (2003); Chitwood *et al.* (2004); Vorarat *et al.* (2004); Hegstad *et al.* (2005); Islam and Powell (2005); Brainard (2006); Cullick *et al.* (2007); Lev and Murphy (2007); Bahmannia (2008); Ghazi *et al.* (2008); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2008); Liu and Ford (2008); Orimo *et al.* (2008); Virine (2008); Zhu and Arcos (2008); Abhulimen (2009); Gomez *et al.* (2009); Jafarizadeh and Bratvold (2009); Verre *et*

1 *al.* (2009); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2010); Pinturier *et al.* (2010); Angert *et al.* (2011);
2 Chen *et al.* (2011); Gong *et al.* (2011); Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011); Streeter and
3 Moody (2011); Grosse-Sommer *et al.* (2012); Schulze *et al.* (2012); Shrivastva *et al.* (2012);
4 Burlini and Araruna (2013); Hernandez *et al.* (2013); Pettersen *et al.* (2013); Pierce and Wills
5 (2013); Trujillo *et al.* (2013); Fergestad *et al.* (2014); Jeong *et al.* (2014); Kullawan *et al.*
6 (2014); Lilien *et al.* (2014); Siveter *et al.* (2014); Wright *et al.* (2014); Chilukuri *et al.* (2015);
7 Chun *et al.* (2015); de Wardt and Peterson (2015); Oruganti *et al.* (2015); Adam and Ghosh
8 (2016); Bello *et al.* (2016); Johannknecht *et al.* (2016a); Ortiz-Volcan *et al.* (2016); Seo *et al.*
9 (2016); Steuten and Onna (2016)).

10
11 We also identified the sources of journals and conference proceedings in which the
12 papers were published. It was found that the literature has been scattered among twenty-seven
13 academic journals and thirty-eight conference proceedings. Among the journals, the “Journal
14 of Petroleum Technology” – which is published by the Society of Petroleum Engineers (SPE)
15 – contained the largest number of papers on the topic (4 papers). Furthermore, about 60
16 percent of the conference papers have been published in proceedings for the SPE oil and gas
17 energy conferences, amongst which the SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition
18 with 8 papers is the most dominant event.

19 *4.3 Distribution of studies based on fossil fuel sources*

20
21 The upstream oil and gas sector involves the exploration and development of conventional
22 fossil fuel reserves as well as unconventional fossil fuel deposits such as shale oil and gas.
23 The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) (<https://www.eia.gov/>) projected that
24 shale gas production is expected to reach 90 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d) in 2040, which
25 is more than twice current levels. However, the geological and technical approaches
26 employed in the exploration and development of shale gas differ from those of the
27 conventional oil and gas. Some of the important issues in the shale oil and gas sector that may
28 require the use of DMS methods include the evaluation of cost of exploration, development
29 and production, estimation of revenues, and the examination of the environmental impact of
30 shale oil and gas production over the life span of a field.

31
32 Those studies that have discussed or applied different DMS methods to support the
33 development of both conventional and unconventional fossil fuel sources in the upstream oil
34 and gas sector were identified and reviewed. Out of 110 studies included in this review, only
35 five papers (representing around 4.5 percent of all studies) addressed the decision-making
36 processes regarding shale gas production and GHG emission effects, while the rest of the
37 studies focused on decision-making aspects of the conventional fossil fuel sources. These five
38 studies about the shale gas production and GHG footprint assessment are highlighted below:

39
40 *Gong et al.* (2011) presented a decline-curve-based reservoir model with a decision
41 model to determine optimal development strategies in shale reservoirs by incorporating
42 uncertainty in production forecasts. *Stephenson et al.* (2011) modelled the relative GHG
43

1 emissions from both shale gas and conventional natural gas production. One of the key
2 findings of the study was that the well-to-wire (WtW) emissions from conventional natural
3 gas production were estimated to be approximately 1.8%-2.4% less than that of shale gas.
4 [Burnham et al. \(2012\)](#) synthesized the current scientific knowledge on methane emissions
5 from shale gas, conventional oil and gas as well as coal to estimate GHG emissions from
6 different fossil fuel sources. The study further indicated that the combustion of natural gas
7 produces significantly less GHG as compared to conventional coal and oil sources. In [Weber
8 and Clavin \(2012\)](#), the upstream carbon footprint from both shale and conventional natural
9 gas production was assessed and compared. The results showed that there was no significant
10 difference in the upstream carbon footprint from these two types of natural gas production.
11 [Zavala-Araiza et al. \(2015\)](#) used a life-cycle allocation method to assign methane emissions
12 to natural gas and oil production from shale formations.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *4.4 Distribution of studies based on oil and gas field's lifecycle phases*

20
21 In this Section, the reviewed papers are classified according to the phases of oil and gas field
22 lifecycle. The lifecycle, as shown in [Figure 3](#), is divided into five phases of exploration,
23 development, production, life extension, and abandonment/decommission. These lifecycle
24 phases are briefly explained in the followings:
25
26
27

28 **** Figure 3****

29
30
31 **Figure 3.** The lifecycle phases of an oil and gas field.

- 32
33
34 - Exploration phase: This phase involves the search for economic and recoverable oil and
35 natural gas deposits (either onshore or offshore) and includes detailed surface
36 exploration, drilling and well testing.
37
38 - Development phase: The development phase occurs after exploration. The main
39 activities during this phase include construction of production facilities, water injection
40 and abandonment wells, an FPSO, subsea structures, etc., laying of flow lines and
41 umbilicals, and installation of subsea systems for subsequent commencement of oil and
42 gas production.
43
44 - Production phase: This phase employs various skills, advanced technologies and
45 professionals to extract oil and gas products and subsequently separate two- or three-
46 phase products into oil, gas, produced water and solid particles. The oil and natural gas
47 products are then transported to the agreed delivery points either through the use of
48 export lines or shuttle tankers in the case of offshore production. This phase also
49 involves workover operations of production wells and maintenance of oil and gas
50 production facilities which is carried out to ensure effective and efficient production.
51
52 - Life extension phase: This phase begins when oil and gas production facilities reach end
53 of their original design lifetimes and the process of life extension is economically and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 technically viable. Also, in some countries due to highly restrictive regulations on
2 construction of new fields, companies use life extension as means to avoid phasing out
3 existing fields. Life extension of oil and gas facilities delivers some benefits such as
4 increased production, reduced capital expenditures (CAPEX) associated with
5 constructing new facility, increased job creation, reduced CO₂ emissions, and lowered
6 financial risk compared to risk of investing in greenfield project (Shafiee and Animah,
7 2017).

- 8
9
10
11 - Abandonment/Decommission: This phase represents the final stage of oil and gas field's
12 lifecycle, taking place when production facilities are no longer safe or cannot produce
13 economic quantities of oil and gas products. Oil and gas field abandonment is a critical
14 and complex decision-making process which involves the use of DMS methods in terms
15 of risk analysis, cost estimation, health and safety, and environmental assessment (Kaiser
16 and Pulsipher, 2004). Typical decommissioning activities include well plugging, full
17 removal of platforms, partial removal platforms, trenching and burial of pipelines, etc.
18 (Koroma *et al.*, 2018).
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Table 1** shows a detailed distribution of the published papers on the application of DMS
25 methods in upstream oil and gas industry according to the phases of oil and gas field's
26 lifecycle taken into consideration. Those publications which did not report the phase of
27 lifecycle in the decision-making process were excluded from the table. As can be seen, the
28 DMS methods have received the most attention during the development phase, followed by
29 the production and exploration phases.
30
31
32
33
34

35 ****Table 1****

36
37 **Table 1.** Distribution of studies according to the oil and gas field's lifecycle phases.
38
39

40 *4.5 Distribution of studies based on data collection techniques*

41 Decision-making in relation to the upstream oil and gas activities should be reliant on
42 accurate data for the analysis. This means that the outcomes of a decision are dependent upon
43 the quality of input data, hence making data collection an essential step of decision-making
44 process in the upstream oil and gas sector. Applying the DMS methods to make effective
45 decisions usually requires a database of cost information (e.g. cost of design, operation and
46 maintenance (O&M), decommissioning, etc.), equipment failure mechanisms and root causes,
47 degradation rates, environmental data (e.g. CO_{2eq} as a results of production and operation of
48 equipment) as well as experts' opinions about the evaluating criteria. Without using high
49 quality data, the results of decision-making may lead to inaccurate conclusions. In a study,
50 Vorarat *et al.* (2004) discussed the data requirements for LCC analysis of oil and gas field
51 projects.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Generally, the use of survey methods (including questionnaires, face-to-face or telephone interviews, or a combination of these) to obtain experts' judgement and knowledge is one of common data collection techniques in the oil and gas sector (Virine, 2008). Many researchers often consider survey techniques more subjective and, thus, less accurate than experimentally acquired data. Nevertheless, it still remains one of the popular ways of data collection for decision-making in the upstream oil and gas sector. Another means of obtaining data for decision-making is through direct measurement or observation (such as close visual inspection (CVI)). The data stored in monitoring databases or data acquisition systems is also another source for decision makers in the upstream oil and gas industry. Additionally, information from other primary/original sources such as published literature, company's reports, legislations of regulators, suppliers' databases, etc. is also used for decision analysis in the upstream sector.

Among the reviewed papers, Aycaguer *et al.* (2001) used data generated from the continuous monitoring of a process safety system to perform ELCA, in order to assess the benefits obtained from storing CO₂ in active reservoirs and its corresponding environmental impact over the process lifetime. Eight studies, including Gatta (1999), Bahmannia (2008), Abhulimen (2009), Pinturier *et al.* (2010), Nam *et al.* (2011), Kullawan *et al.* (2014), Sandler *et al.* (2014) and Ghani *et al.* (2015) have utilized data from published literature and handbooks.

In Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988), Dear *et al.* (1995), Smith and Celant (1995), Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001), Islam and Powell (2005), Goodwin *et al.* (2012), Wright *et al.* (2014) and Shafiee *et al.* (2016), the information from industry was used as input to support ELCA and CBA analyses. Studies conducted by Johannknecht *et al.* (2016a) and Johannknecht *et al.* (2016b) collected data from previously commercialized products to develop a LCC toolkit. Ghazi *et al.* (2008) and Ratnayaka and Markeset (2010) combined different data collection techniques in their respective studies. Eight studies of Joshi *et al.* (1998), Suslick and Furtado (2001), Suslick *et al.* (2001), Li *et al.* (2009), Verre *et al.* (2009), Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011), Streeter and Moody (2011) and Sandler *et al.* (2014) applied data acquired from other projects/fields to support decision-making in the upstream oil and gas sector.

The rest of the publications failed to indicate the type of techniques used for collecting the data and hence were excluded from our analysis.

4.6 Distribution of studies based on DMS methods

In terms of the decision-making methods employed in the upstream oil and gas sector, all the one-hundred and ten identified publications were analysed and classified into various categories as follows:

- Operational research (OR)
- Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)

- Real options analysis (ROA)
- Life cycle costing (LCC)
- Environmental life cycle assessment (ELCA)
- Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS)
- Decision tree analysis (DTA)
- MCDA (WSM, AHP/ANP, MAUT, TOPSIS, PROMETHEE, ECLECTRE, VIKOR)
- Hybrid MCDA (when a study combines two or more MCDA methods);
- Fuzzy logic analysis (FLA)
- Others (when a decision-making method different from those mentioned above is used).

The distribution of the publications based on the method used to support decision-making in the upstream oil and gas is shown in [Table 2](#). As can be seen, LCC method with 39 papers has received the most attention in the literature, followed by ELCA with 18 papers, CBA with 14 papers, DTA with 10 papers and MCDA methods with 10 papers. Another interesting observation from [Table 2](#) is that the classical MAUT and AHP/ANP methods are the most popular MCDA methods to support decision-making in the upstream sector, whereas other MCDA methods such as WSM, TOPSIS, PROMETHEE, ELECTRE and VIKOR have not been extensively utilized. Moreover, our search revealed that only one study in the literature has used the fuzzy set theory approach.

****Table 2****

Table 2. Classification of studies based on decision-making methods.

[Figure 4](#) shows a detailed distribution of various DMS methods applied to the upstream oil and gas sector during the past four decades.

****Figure 4****

Figure 4. Distribution of DMS methods applied to the upstream sector during the past four decades.

4.7 Distribution of studies based on geographical location of case studies

The results of our content analysis indicate that 38 out of 110 publications (i.e. about 34.5 percent of the total number of publications) have reported a case example of the application of DMS methods to the upstream oil and gas sector. Out of these 38 published works, 27 studies have mentioned the geographical location of the case study. [Table 3](#) presents the aim and the geographical location and of the identified case studies around the world.

****Table 3****

Table 3. Distribution of studies based on geographical location of case studies.

1 As can be seen, the continents of North and South America have reported the largest
2 number of case studies, accounting for 41 percent of the total number of publications. This is
3 followed by the Middle East region and Asia with 30 percent of the publications. The North
4 Sea which comprises the UK Continental Shelf (UKCS) and Norwegian Continental Shelf
5 (NCS) account for 15 percent of the publications. Mediterranean Sea and West Africa regions
6 also have been studied each in 7% of the case studies.
7
8
9

10 **5. Concluding remarks and future research directions**

11 Over the past four decades, a wide range of qualitative and quantitative decision-making
12 support (DMS) methods have been developed in the literature to assist upstream oil and gas
13 industry stakeholders to better understand reservoir characteristics, simulate field operations,
14 develop low carbon production technologies, and make justifiable business decisions
15 regarding field exploration, development and production activities. In this paper, we reviewed
16 one hundred and ten studies (including 32 journal articles and 78 conference papers) about
17 the use of different DMS methods in the upstream oil and gas industry. These studies were
18 published by many scholars and practitioners throughout the world in twenty-seven academic
19 journals and thirty-eight conference proceedings in English language between the years 1977
20 and 2016. The key issues of the subject area, including the type of DMS methods applied to
21 support the decision-makers, the phases of oil and gas field's lifecycle considered in the
22 analysis, data collection techniques, case study regions that have utilised DMS methods to
23 solve the problem, etc. were highlighted and discussed.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 As this study revealed, the number of publications related to the application of DMS
35 methods in the upstream oil and gas industry have grown significantly over the past four
36 decades. The analysis of the studies based on decision-making methods indicated that the
37 operational research (OR) methods such as mixed integer programming (MIP), economic
38 analysis methods such as cost-benefit analysis (CBA), real options analysis (ROA) and life
39 cycle costing (LCC), statistical methods such as Monte Carlo simulation (MCS) and decision
40 tree analysis (DTA); and environmental assessment methods such as environmental life cycle
41 assessment (ELCA) have received the most attention in the literature. However, the use of
42 multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) methods such as analytic hierarchy process (AHP)
43 and analytic network process (ANP) have been gaining momentum in recent years. Such
44 methods are able to consider simultaneously multiple technical, economic, social, legal and
45 environmental attributes of decision-making problems in the upstream sector. Moreover, in
46 order to account for uncertainties associated with practitioners' subjective perception and
47 experience in decision-making, soft computing methods such as fuzzy set theory, rough set
48 theory, artificial intelligence (AI), and neural networks (NN) have become popular.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 The findings of this literature review and the results of the proposed classification
59 scheme offer interesting conclusions that could be useful to field owners, asset managers,
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 service providers, policy makers, environmentalist, financial analyst, and regulatory agencies
2 to gain better insight about their business activities with well-informed decision-making
3 processes, find out how to determine the most effective DMS method for each problem, and
4 to identify real-life applications and case studies. However, there is still large scope of
5 research on the use of decision analytics modelling in the upstream, midstream and
6 downstream oil and gas sectors. Some of the potential directions for future research are listed
7 below:
8
9

- 10 1. When comparing the number of studies that have used DMS methods to support decision
11 analysis of exploration, development and production activities of conventional and
12 unconventional fossil fuel sources, it was realised that unconventional fossil fuel (such as
13 shale oil and gas) has received very little attention in the literature. Hence, further
14 research works can be conducted on various aspects of decision-making for the
15 exploration, development and production of shale oil and gas.
16
17
- 18 2. It was found from this review that all the studies in relation to unconventional fossil fuel
19 sources utilized ELCA method to estimate GHG footprint of shale gas production.
20 Nevertheless, the development and production of shale gas present huge economic
21 opportunities and it will be of great interest if future research work can use other decision
22 analytics methods to estimate the economic potential of shale gas projects.
23
24
- 25 3. The majority of the DMS methods identified in this study were data-driven and required
26 good quality data so that decisions could be made with high degree of confidence.
27 However, the paucity of good quality data is still considered as a challenge in the
28 upstream oil and gas sector. In order to overcome this challenge, there is an essential
29 need for the stakeholders to define measures, procedures, and data collection platforms
30 capable of providing decision makers with appropriate information to make suitable
31 decisions.
32
33
- 34 4. Our findings indicated that decision-making tools such as LCC, ELCA, CBA, DTA,
35 MCS and ROA have received good attention in industrial case studies. However, MCDA
36 methods and also hybrid decision analysis methods have rarely been reported to be
37 applied to real-case projects in the upstream oil and gas sector.
38
39
- 40 5. Despite the wide application of AHP/ANP methods to solve decision-making problems
41 in the upstream oil and gas industry, the literature on the use of other MCDA methods
42 such as TOPSIS, PROMETHEE, ELECTRE, VIKOR and fuzzy MCDA techniques is
43 very limited.
44
45
- 46 6. Life extension and field abandonment/decommission are the current challenges facing
47 the upstream oil and gas sector. This is because significant number of facilities
48 supporting operations in the upstream oil and gas sector are approaching or have already
49 exceeded their original design lifetimes and asset managers have to make a decision
50 between life extension and decommissioning. However, very few research studies have
51 used DMS methods to address the challenges of life extension and/or decommissioning
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1 decision-making in the oil and gas industry (Shafiee and Animah, 2017). Therefore,
2 future work must direct efforts at applying DMS to address the challenges during life
3 extension and decommission phase of asset life cycle in the upstream oil and gas sector.

- 4
5 7. This review revealed that the West Africa region, though produces a sizeable amount of
6 the crude oil and natural gas, has reported the least number of case studies about the
7 application of DMS method to provide robust solutions for exploration, development and
8 production activities. Therefore, further researches can be conducted about this region in
9 the future.
10
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

- Abhulimen, K. (2009). Optimal life-cycle model for ranking environmental performance of E&P programs, in: *SPE Americas E&P Environmental and Safety Conference*, 23-25 March, San Antonio, Texas, USA, pp. 1–43.
- Adam, S. and Ghosh, S. (2016). Application of flexible composite pipe as a cost effective alternative to carbon steel - design experience, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Asia*, 22-25 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–12.
- Angert, P.F., Isebor, O.J. and Litvak, M.L. (2011). Early life cycle field development optimization of a complex deepwater Gulf of Mexico field, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Brasil*, 4-6 October, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, pp. 1–12.
- Animah, I. and Shafiee, M. (2018). Condition assessment, remaining useful life prediction and life extension decision making for offshore oil and gas assets. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries* 53, 17-28.
- Animah, I., Shafiee, M., Simms, N., Erkoyuncu, J.A. and Maiti, J. (2018) Selection of the most suitable life extension strategy for ageing offshore assets using a life-cycle cost-benefit analysis approach. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, 24(3), <https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-09-2016-0041>.
- Aycaguer, A., Lev-On, M. and Winer, A. M. (2001). Reducing carbon dioxide emissions with enhanced Oil recovery projects: A life cycle assessment approach. *Energy Fuels* 15, 303–308.
- Bahmannia, G. (2008). Life cycle assessment (LCA) in oil and gas industries as an effective sustainability development measure: case study. Sarkhoon gas treating plant, in: *19th World Petroleum Congress*, 29 June-3 July, Madrid, Spain, pp. 1–14.
- Balch, E.R., Kavanagh, W.K., Griffin, P.E., Chouinard, L.E., Mechanics, A., Cooper, C. and Thompson, H.M. (2003). Running fairings for deepwater drilling in the Gulf of Mexico – a cost-benefit approach to deciding the faired length, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 5-8 May, Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1–7.
- Balen, R., Mens, H.-Z. and Economides, M. (1988). Applications of the Net Present Value (NPV) in the optimization of hydraulic fractures, in: *SPE Eastern Regional Meeting*, 1-4 November, Charleston, West Virginia, USA, 11 pages.
- Bello, O., Teodoriu, C., Yaqoob, T., Oppelt, J., Holzmann, J., Obiwanne, A. (2016). Application of artificial intelligence techniques in drilling system design and operations: a state of the art

- 1 review and future research pathways. In: *SPE Nigeria Annual International Conference and*
2 *Exhibition*, 2-4 August, Lagos, Nigeria.
- 3 Begg, S., Bratvold, R. and Campbell, J. (2002). The value of flexibility in managing uncertainty in oil
4 and gas investments. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 29 September-2
5 October, San Antonio, Texas, USA.
- 6
7 Brainard, R.R. (2006). A process used in evaluation of managed-pressure drilling candidates and
8 probabilistic cost-benefit analysis, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 1-4 May, Houston,
9 Texas, USA, 13 pages.
- 10
11 Brans, J.-P. and Vincke, P. (1985). Note—A preference ranking organisation method: (The
12 PROMETHEE method for multiple criteria decision-making). *Management Science* 31, 647–
13 656.
- 14
15 Bratvold, R.B., Bickel, J.E., Risk, A. and Lohne, H.P. (2009). Value of information in the oil and gas
16 industry: past, present, and future. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering* 12(4), 630–638.
- 17
18 Burlini, P.S. and Araruna, J.T. (2013). Life Cycle Concept (LCC) in the waste management in the
19 O&G offshore exploration. in: *North Africa Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 15-17 April,
20 Cairo, Egypt, pp. 1514–1518.
- 21
22 Burnham, A., Han, J., Clark, C.E., Wang, M., Dunn, J.B. and Palou-Rivera, I. (2012). Life-cycle
23 greenhouse gas emissions of shale gas, natural gas, coal, and petroleum. *Environmental Science*
24 *& Technology*, 46(2), 619–627.
- 25
26 Bybee, K. (2009). The judgment-elicitation process for multicriteria decision making. *Journal of*
27 *Petroleum Technology*, 61(10), 60–62.
- 28
29 Castro, G.T., Morooka, C.K. and Bordalo, S.N. (2002). Decision-making process for a deepwater
30 production system considering environmental, technological and financial risks, in: *SPE Annual*
31 *Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 29 September-2 October, San Antonio, Texas, USA, pp.
32 1–8.
- 33
34 Caterino, N., Iervolino, I., Manfredi, G. and Cosenza, E. (2009). Comparative analysis of multi-
35 criteria decision-making methods for seismic structural retrofitting. *Computer-Aided Civil and*
36 *Infrastructure Engineering* 24(6), 432–445.
- 37
38 Cheldi, T., Cavaasi, P., Lazzari, L. and Pezzotta, L. (1997). Use of decision tree analysis and Monte
39 Carlo simulation, in: *NACE-International Conference on Corrosion*, 9-14 March, New Orleans,
40 Louisiana, USA, pp. 1–10.
- 41
42 Chen, C., Li, G. and Reynolds, A.C. (2011). Robust constrained optimization of short and long-term
43 NPV for closed-loop reservoir management, in: *SPE Reservoir Simulation Symposium*, 21-23
44 February, The Woodlands, Texas, USA. pp. 1–23.
- 45
46 Cheng, S., Chan, C. and Huang, G.H. (2002). Using multiple criteria decision analysis for supporting
47 decision of solid waste management. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health, Part A:*
48 *Toxic/Hazardous Substances and Environmental Engineering*, 37(6), 975–990.
- 49
50 Chilukuri, P., Bowerbank, G. and Bhattacharya, A. (2015). Understanding the impact of hydrocarbon
51 co-absorption losses on revenues from your Gas Plants : The reality through life-cycle costs, in:
52 *International Petroleum Technology Conference*, 6-9 December, Doha, Qatar, pp. 1–10.
- 53
54 Chitwood, J.E., Wanvik, L., Doreen Chin, Y. and Sheets, B.J. (2004). Techno-economic evaluations
55 of deepwater marginal field developments, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 3-6 May,
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1844–1853.

- 1 Chun, N.A.A.P., Bravo, R.J.C. and Quiñones, V.A.H. (2015). Forecasting reservoir management
2 through life cycle assessment: case study Marañón basin, in: *SPE Latin American and*
3 *Caribbean Petroleum Engineering Conference*, 18-20 November, Quito, Ecuador, pp. 1–26.
- 4 Cullick, A.S., Cude, R.G. and Tarman, M. (2007). Optimizing field development concepts for
5 complex offshore production systems. In: *SPE Offshore Europe*, 4-7 September, Aberdeen,
6 Scotland, U.K.
- 7
8
9
10 Cullick, A.S., Heath, D., Narayanan, K., April, J. and Kelly, J. (2003). Optimizing multiple-field
11 scheduling and production strategy with reduced risk. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and*
12 *Exhibition*, 5-8 October, Denver, Colorado, USA.
- 13
14 de Wardt, J.P. and Peterson, S.K. (2015). Well cost estimation and control - advanced methodologies
15 for effective, in: *SPE/IADC Drilling Conference and Exhibition*, 17-19 March, London,
16 England, UK. pp. 1–18.
- 17
18 Dear, S., Beasley, R.D. and Barr, K.P. (1995). Use of a decision tree to select the mud system for the
19 Oso field, Nigeria. *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 47(10), 909–912.
- 20
21 Denney, D. (1999). Monobores improve life-cycle cost. *Journal of Petroleum Technology* 51(2), 1–2.
- 22
23 Denney, D. (2002). Multicriteria decision-making in strategic reservoir planning. *Journal of*
24 *Petroleum Technology* 54(9), 83–84.
- 25
26 Deore, P. (2012). Decision making in upstream oil and gas industry - an integrated approach, in: *SPE*
27 *Oil and Gas India Conference and Exhibition*, 28-30 March, Mumbai, India. pp. 1–5.
- 28
29 Dey, P.K. (2002). Project risk management: a combined analytic hierarchy process and decision tree
30 approach. *Cost Engineering* 44(3), 13–26.
- 31
32 Dey, P.K. (2012). Project risk management using multiple criteria decision-making technique and
33 decision tree analysis: a case study of Indian oil refinery. *Production Planning & Control*
34 23(12), 903–921.
- 35
36 Dinmohammadi, A. and Shafiee, M. (2017). Determination of the most suitable technology transfer
37 strategy for wind turbines using an integrated AHP-TOPSIS decision model. *Energies*, 10(5), 17
38 pages.
- 39
40 El-Reedy, M.A. (2003). Life-cycle cost design of deteriorating offshore structures, in: *Offshore*
41 *Mediterranean Conference*, 26-28 March, Ravenna, Italy, pp. 1–7.
- 42
43 Emovon, I., Norman, R.A. and Murphy, A.J. (2018). Hybrid MCDM based methodology for selecting
44 the optimum maintenance strategy for ship machinery systems. *Journal of Intelligent*
45 *Manufacturing* 29(3), 519–531.
- 46
47 Erdogan, M., Mudford, B., Chenoweth, G., Holeywell, R. and Jakubson, J. (2001). Optimization of
48 decision tree and simulation portfolios- A comparison, in: *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and*
49 *Evaluation Symposium*, 2-3 April, Dallas, Texas, USA, pp. 1–8.
- 50
51 Fergestad, D., Løtveit, S.A. and Leira, B.J. (2014). Life-cycle assessment of flexible risers, in: *33rd*
52 *International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, 8–13 June, San
53 Francisco, California, USA, pp. 1–10.
- 54
55 Ferreira, D., Suslick, S., Farley, J., Costanza, R. and Krivov, S. (2004). A decision model for financial
56 assurance instruments in the upstream petroleum sector, *Energy Policy* 32, 1173–1184.
- 57
58 Finch, J.H., Macmillan, F.E. and Simpson, G.S. (2002). On the diffusion of probabilistic investment
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- appraisal and decision-making procedures in the UK's upstream oil and gas industry, *Research Policy* 31(6), 969-988.
- Fowler, A.M., Macreadie, P.I., Jones, D.O.B. and Booth, D.J. (2014). A multi-criteria decision approach to decommissioning of offshore oil and gas infrastructure. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 87, 20–29.
- Fuller, S. and Peterson, S. (1996). *Life cycle costing manual for the federal energy management program*. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Washington, USA, 210 pages.
- Garg, A., Vishwanathan, S. and Avashia, V. (2013). Life cycle greenhouse gas emission assessment of major petroleum oil products for transport and household sectors in India. *Energy Policy* 58, 38–48.
- Gatta, S.R. (1999). Decision tree analysis and risk modeling to appraise investments on major oil field projects, in: *Middle East Oil Show and Conference*, 20-23 February, Bahrain, pp. 1–16.
- Gerbacia, W.E. and Al-Shammari, H. (2001). Multi-criteria decision making in strategic reservoir planning using the analytic hierarchy process, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 30 September-3 October, New Orleans, Louisiana. pp. 1–12.
- Ghani, A., Khan, F. and Garaniya, V. (2015). Improved oil recovery using CO₂ as an injection medium: a detailed analysis. *Journal of Petroleum Exploration and Production Technology* 5(3), 241–254.
- Ghazi, M., Quaranta, G., Duplay, J. and Khodja, M. (2008). Life-cycle assessment (LCA) of drilling mud in arid area : Evaluation of specific fate factors of toxic emissions to groundwater, in: *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production*, 15-17 April, Nice, France. pp. 1–14.
- Ghosh, C., Maiti, J., Shafiee, M. and Kumaraswamy, K.G. (2018). Reduction of life cycle costs for a contemporary helicopter through improvement of reliability and maintainability parameters. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management* 35(2), 545–567.
- Goldsmith, R., Eriksen, R., Saucier, B. and Deegan, F.J. (2001). Life cycle cost of deepwater production systems, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 30 April-3 May, Houston, Texas. pp. 1–12.
- Gomez, Y., Khazaeni, Y., Mohaghegh, S. D. and Gaskari, R. (2009). Top down intelligent reservoir modeling. In: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 4-7 October, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA.
- Gong, X., McVay, D., Bickel, J.E. and Montiel, L.V. (2011). Integrated reservoir and decision modeling to optimize northern Barnett shale development strategies. In: *SPE Canadian Unconventional Resources Conference*, 15-17 November, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- Goodwin, S., Carlson, K., Douglas, C. and Knox, K. (2012). Life cycle analysis of water use and intensity of oil and gas recovery in Wattenberg field , Colo. *Oil & Gas Journal* 110(5), 48–59.
- Grosse-Sommer, A., Sava, X. and Gilbert, Y.M. (2012). Applying life cycle assessment to evaluate the sustainability of completion fluids, in: *SPE Middle East Health, Safety, Security, and Environment Conference and Exhibition*, 2-4 April, Abu Dhabi, UAE, pp. 1–12.
- Guedes, J. and Santos, P. (2016). Valuing an offshore oil exploration and production project through real options analysis. *Energy Economics* 60, 377-386.

- 1 Hammond, R.J. (1966). Convention and limitation in benefit-cost analysis. *Natural Resources Journal*
2 6, 195–222.
- 3 Harding, T.B. (1996). Life cycle value/cost decision making, in: *SPE International Petroleum*
4 *Conference and Exhibition of Mexico*, 5-7 March, Villahermosa, Mexico. pp. 1–10.
- 5 Hegstad, B.K., Tollefsen, S., Arghir, D. V., Cullick, A.S., Narayanan, K., Heath, D.E. and Lever, J.C.
6 (2005). Rapid scenario and risk analysis for a complex gas field with large uncertainties. In: *SPE*
7 *Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 26-29 September, Houston, Texas, USA.
- 8
9
10 Heinze, L.R., Winkler, H.W. and Lea, J.F. (1995). Decision tree for selection of artificial lift method,
11 in: *SPE Production Operations Symposium*, 2-4 April, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, USA, 8
12 pages.
- 13
14 Hernandez, J., Galindo, J.M., Rivera, C.D.P.C. and Salas, C.M. (2013). Life cycle cost analysis for a
15 nitrogen over hydraulic pumping unit, in: *SPE Artificial Lift Conference-Americas*, 21-22 May,
16 Cartagena, Colombia, pp. 234–239.
- 17
18 Huang, J.P., Poh, K.L. and Ang, B.W. (1995). Decision analysis in energy and environmental
19 modeling. *Energy* 20(9), 843–855.
- 20
21 Islam, M. and Powell, D. (2005). Cost-benefit analysis of flowline replacement for a major Middle
22 East oil producer, in: *NACE-International Conference on Corrosion*, 3-7 April, Houston, Texas,
23 USA, pp. 1–19.
- 24
25
26 Iyer, R.R., Grossmann, I.E., Vasantharajan, S. and Cullick, A.S. (1998). Optimal planning and
27 scheduling of offshore oil field infrastructure investment and operations, *Industrial &*
28 *Engineering Chemistry Research* 37, 1380-1397.
- 29
30 Jacquemin, L., Pontalier, P.Y. and Sablayrolles, C. (2012). Life cycle assessment (LCA) applied to
31 the process industry: A review. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment* 17(8), 1028–
32 1041.
- 33
34 Jafarizadeh, B. and Bratvold, R.B. (2009). Real options analysis in petroleum exploration and
35 production: a new paradigm in investment analysis. In: *SPE EUROPEC/EAGE Conference and*
36 *Exhibition*, 8-11 June, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- 37
38 Jentsch Jr, W.A. and Marrs, R.D. (1988). Computerized automation of oilfield production operations:
39 An extensive 5-year study into the costs and benefits. *SPE Production Engineering* 3(3), 299–
40 304.
- 41
42
43 Jeong, M.S., Cho, J. and Lee, K.S. (2014). Optimized WAG cycle and well pattern of CO₂ EOR
44 projects for maximum NPV in heterogeneous reservoirs, in: *24th International Ocean and Polar*
45 *Engineering Conference*, 15-20 June, Busan, Korea, pp. 152–158.
- 46
47 Johannknecht, F., Gatzen, M.M., Hahn, D. and Lachmayer, R. (2016a). Holistic life cycle costing
48 approach for different development phases of drilling tools state of the art, in: *International*
49 *Petroleum Technology Conference*, 14-16 November, Bangkok, Thailand, pp. 1–11.
- 50
51 Johannknecht, F., Gatzen, M.M. and Lachmayer, R. (2016b). Life cycle cost model for considering
52 fleet utilization in early conceptual design phases. *Procedia CIRP* 48, 68–72.
- 53
54 Joshi, S., Castanier, L.M. and Brigham, W.E. (1998). Techno-economic and risk evaluation of an
55 EOR project, in: *SPE India Oil and Gas Conference and Exhibition*, 17-19 February, New
56 Delhi, India, pp. 633–647.
- 57
58
59 Joshi, S.D. (2003). Cost/benefits of horizontal wells, in: *SPE Western Regional/AAPG Pacific Section*
60
61
62
63
64
65

Joint Meeting, 19-24 May, Long Beach, California. pp. 1–9.

- 1 Kabir, G., Sadiq, R. and Tesfamariam, S. (2014). A review of multi-criteria decision-making methods
2 for infrastructure management. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 10(9), 1176–1210.
- 3 Kaiser, M.J. and Pulsipher, A.G. (2004). A binary choice severance selection model for the removal
4 of offshore structures in the Gulf of Mexico. *Mar. Policy* 28, 97–115.
- 5
6 Kayrbekova, D. and Markeset, T. (2008). Life cycle cost analysis in design of oil and gas production
7 facilities to be used in harsh, remote and sensitive environments, in: *The European Safety and*
8 *Reliability Conference (ESREL)*, 22-25 September, Valencia, Spain, pp. 2955–2961.
- 9
10 Kayrbekova, D. and Markeset, T. (2010). Economic decision support for offshore oil and gas
11 production in arctic conditions: identifying the needs, in: *The European Safety and Reliability*
12 *Conference (ESREL)*, 5-9 September, Rhodes; Greece, pp. 1274–1279.
- 13
14 Kayrbekova, D., Markeset, T. and Ghodrati, B. (2011). Activity-based life cycle cost analysis as an
15 alternative to conventional LCC in engineering design. *International Journal of System*
16 *Assurance Engineering and Management* 2(3), 218–225.
- 17
18 Korn, D.H., Rothermel, T.W., Mansvelt-Beck, F., Guerin-Calvert, M. and Perry, C.W. (1978). The
19 national benefits/costs of enhanced oil recovery research, in: *SPE Eastern Regional Meeting*, 1-3
20 November, Washington, D.C., USA, 8 pages.
- 21
22 Koroma, S.G., Animah, I., Shafiee, M. and Tee, K.F (2018) Decommissioning of deep and ultra-deep
23 water oil and gas pipelines: issues and challenges. *International Journal of Oil, Gas and Coal*
24 *Technology* (in print).
- 25
26 Kullawan, K., Bratvold, R.B. and Bickel, J.E. (2014). Value creation with multi-criteria decision
27 making in geosteering operations, in: *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and Evaluation Symposium*,
28 19-20 May ,Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1–15.
- 29
30 Lassen, T. and Syvertsen, K. (1996). Fatigue reliability and life cycle cost analysis of mooring chains,
31 in: *The Sixth International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference*, 26-31 May, Los
32 Angeles, California, USA, pp. 418–422.
- 33
34 Lev, V. and Murphy, D. (2007). Analysis of multi-criteria decision-making methodologies for the
35 petroleum industry, in: *International Petroleum Technology Conference*, 4-6 December, Dubai,
36 UAE. pp. 1–7.
- 37
38 Li, G., Zhang, D. and Yue, Q. (2009). Life-cycle cost-effective optimum design of ice-resistant
39 offshore platforms. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering* 131(3), 031501, 9
40 pages.
- 41
42 Lilien, J.P., Jin, H. and Gloria, T.P. (2014). Implementation of life cycle assessment at one company:
43 Lessons learned and good practices, in: *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and*
44 *Environment*, 17-19 March, Long Beach, California, USA, pp. 1–8.
- 45
46 Liu, S. and Ford, J. (2008). Cost/benefit analysis of petrophysical data acquisition, in: *49th Annual*
47 *Logging Symposium*, 25-28 May, Austin, Texas, USA, pp. 1–16.
- 48
49 Lopes, Y.G. and Almeida, A.T. de (2013). A multicriteria decision model for selecting a portfolio of
50 oil and gas exploration projects. *Pesquisa Operacional* 33(3), 417–441.
- 51
52 Macmillan, F. (2000). Risk, uncertainty and investment decision-making in the upstream oil and gas
53 industry, PhD Thesis, University of Aberdeen, UK.
- 54
55 Maddah, B., Al-Hindi, M., Yassine, A. and Wahab, Z. (2014). An integrated approach to state
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 decision-making in upstream hydrocarbon operations with application to Lebanon. In: *IEEE*
2 *Transactions on Engineering Management* 61(4), 755–767.
- 3 Marten, C. and Gatzert, M.M. (2014). Decreasing operational cost of high performance oilfield
4 services by lifecycle driven trade-offs in development. *CIRP Annals*, 63(1), 29–32.
- 5 Meade, L.M. and Presley, A. (2002). R&D project selection using the analytic network process. *IEEE*
6 *Transactions on Engineering Management* 49(1), 59–66.
- 7 Methven, J.O. (1993). The Argyll field life cycle with cost control as the operator's ethos, in: *SPE*
8 *Offshore Europe Conference & Exhibition*, 7-10 September, Aberdeen, United Kingdom, pp.
9 167–174.
- 10 Moan, T. (2007). Fatigue reliability of marine structures, from the Alexander Kielland accident to life
11 cycle assessment. *International Journal of Offshore and Polar Engineering* 17(1), 1–21.
- 12 Mohaghegh, S.D. and Khazaeni, Y. (2011). *Application of artificial intelligence in the upstream oil*
13 *and gas industry*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc., New York, 38 pages.
- 14 Mudford, B.S. (2000). Valuing and comparing oil and gas opportunities: A comparison of decision
15 tree and simulation methodologies, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 1-4
16 October 2000, Dallas, Texas. pp. 1–10.
- 17 Nam, K., Chang, D., Chang, K., Rhee, T. and Lee, I.B. (2011). Methodology of life cycle cost with
18 risk expenditure for offshore process at conceptual design stage. *Energy* 36(3), 1554–1563.
- 19 Orimo, Y., Wilde, J. de, Ichimaru, Y., Terashima, T. and Berg, J. van den. (2008). Methodology to
20 determine floating LNG tank capacity by combination of side-by-side down-time simulation and
21 cost/benefit analysis, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 30 April-3 May, Houston, Texas,
22 USA, pp. 130–136.
- 23 Ortiz-Volcan, J.L., Behbahani, F.M. and Akbar, M.G. (2016). Cost optimization of a thermal recovery
24 project in heavy oil green field - Kuwait, in: *SPE Heavy Oil Conference and Exhibition*, 6-8
25 December, Kuwait City, Kuwait, pp. 1–16.
- 26 Ortiz-Volcan, J.L. and Iskandar, R.A. (2011). A life cycle approach for assessing production
27 technologies in heavy oil well construction projects, in: *SPE Heavy Oil Conference and*
28 *Exhibition*, 12-14 December, Kuwait City, Kuwait, pp. 1–12.
- 29 Oruganti, Y., Mittal, R., McBurney, C.J. and Rodriguez Garza, A. (2015). Re-fracturing in Eagle Ford
30 and Bakken to increase reserves and generate incremental NPV: Field Study, in: *SPE Hydraulic*
31 *Fracturing Technology Conference*, The Woodlands, Texas, USA, 20 pages.
- 32 Paula, M.T.R., Labanca, E.L. and Childs, P. (2001). Subsea manifolds design based on life cycle cost,
33 in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 30 April-3 May, Houston, Texas, USA, pp. 1–10.
- 34 Pettersen, J.B., Hung, C., Solli, C., Steeneveldt, R., Kerr, S. and Aas, N. (2013). A guide to better
35 wells: environmental life-cycle assessment of historical, current and future best practice in
36 drilling, in: *SPE Offshore Europe Conference & Exhibition*, 3-6 September, Aberdeen, UK. pp.
37 1–9.
- 38 Pierce, T.L. and Wills, G.K. (2013). Multicriteria risk assessment of Permian basin tank-battery
39 facilities using GIS, in: *SPE Americas E&P Health, Safety, Security and Environmental*
40 *Conference*, 18-20 March, Galveston, Texas, USA. pp. 1–22.
- 41 Pinturier, L., Garpestad, E., Moltu, U.E. and Lura, H. (2010). Risk characterisation and effects
42 monitoring used to evaluate cost/environmental benefit of installing improved produced water
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 treatment technology on the Ekofisk field (North Sea), in: *SPE International Conference on*
2 *Health, Safety and Environment in Oil and Gas Exploration and Production*, 12-14 April, Rio
3 de Janeiro, Brazil, pp. 1–16.
- 4 Pohekar, S.D. and Ramachandran, M. (2004). Application of multi-criteria decision making to
5 sustainable energy planning - A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 8(4), 365–
6 381.
- 7
8 Poremski, H. (1998). Life cycle assessment - development planning through decommissioning, in:
9 *Offshore Technology Conference*, 4-7 May, Houston, Texas. pp. 1–12.
- 10 Ratnayaka, R.M. and Markeset, T. (2010). Technical integrity management: measures HSE awareness
11 using AHP in selecting a maintenance strategy. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*
12 16(1), 44–63.
- 13 Roosmalen, C.I. Van, Rejimers, J.J., Salza, P. and Wittenberg, L. (1993). Life-cycle design of
14 semisubmersible platforms, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 3-6 May, Houston, Texas. pp.
15 615–625.
- 16 Saaty, T.L. (1980). *The analytical hierarchy process*. McGraw - Hill, New York, USA.
- 17 Saaty, T.L. (1996). Decision making with dependence and feedback. RWS publications, Pittsburgh,
18 USA.
- 19 Sandler, J., Fowler, G., Cheng, K. and Kovscek, A.R. (2014). Solar-generated steam for oil recovery:
20 Reservoir simulation, economic analysis, and life cycle assessment. *Energy Conversion and*
21 *Management* 77, 721–732.
- 22 Sayadi, M.K., Heydari, M. and Shahanaghi, K. (2009). Extension of VIKOR method for decision
23 making problem with interval numbers. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 33(5), 2257–2262.
- 24 Schulze, J.H., Walker, J.N. and Burkholder, M.K. (2012). Integrating the subsurface and the
25 commercial: A new look at monte carlo and decision tree analysis, in: *SPE Hydrocarbon*
26 *Economics and Evaluation Symposium*, 24-25 September, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, pp. 1–11.
- 27 Seo, J.K., Yoon, D., Kim, D. and Kang, K.W. (2016). Point cloud-based erection process method and
28 its application to cost-benefit analysis for modular construction of offshore installations, in: *26th*
29 *International Ocean and Polar Engineering Conference*, 26 June-2 July, Rhodes, Greece, pp.
30 890–895.
- 31 Shafiee, M. (2015a). Maintenance strategy selection problem: an MCDM overview. *Journal of*
32 *Quality in Maintenance Engineering* 21, 378–402.
- 33 Shafiee, M. (2015b). A fuzzy analytic network process model to mitigate the risks associated with
34 offshore wind farms. *Expert Systems with Applications* 42(4), 2143–2152.
- 35 Shafiee, M. and Animah, I. (2017). Life extension decision making of safety critical systems: An
36 overview. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries* 47, 174–188.
- 37 Shafiee, M., Animah, I. and Simms, N. (2016). Development of a techno-economic framework for life
38 extension decision making of safety critical installations. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the*
39 *Process Industries* 44, 299–310.
- 40 Sheremetov, L.B., González-Sánchez, A., López-Yáñez, I. and Ponomarev, A.V. (2013). Time series
41 forecasting: applications to the upstream oil and gas supply chain, *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*
42 46(9), 957-962.
- 43 Shrivastva, C., Al-Mahruqy, S.H., Mjeni, R., Al Kindy, S., Hosein, F., Al-Busaidi, H., Al-Busaidi, J.

- 1 and Laronga, R.J. (2012). Optimising borehole imaging for tight gas exploration: evolving a go -
2 no go decision tree in tight gas reservoirs of the sultanate of Oman, in: *SPE Middle East*
3 *Unconventional Gas Conference and Exhibition*, 23-25 January, Abu Dhabi, UAE, pp. 1–11.
- 4 Silitonga, Y.P. (2015). Real options method vs discounted cash flow method to analyze upstream oil
5 & gas projects. *PM World Journal* Vol. IV, Issue VII, 26 pages.
- 6
7 Silva, V.B.S., Morais, D.C. and Almeida, A.T. (2010). A multicriteria group decision model to
8 support watershed committees in Brazil. *Water Resources Management* 24(14), 4075–4091.
- 9
10 Siveter, R., Castañeda, J., Emmert, A., Lee, A., Martin Juez, J., Stephenson, T., Riera-Palou, X.,
11 Ritter, K., Smith, G.R. and Verduzco, L. (2014). The expanding role of natural gas: Comparing
12 life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions, in: *SPE International Conference on Health, Safety, and*
13 *Environment*, 17-19 March, Long Beach, California, USA, pp. 1–9.
- 14
15 Smith, L.M. and Celant, M. (1995). Life cycle costing - are duplex stainless steel pipelines the cost-
16 effective choice?, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 1-4 May, Houston, Texas, USA, 8
17 pages.
- 18
19 Smith, S.J., Tweedie, A.A.P. and Gallivan, J.D. (1997). Evaluating the performance of multi-lateral
20 producing wells: cost benefits and potential risks, in: *Latin American and Caribbean Petroleum*
21 *Engineering Conference*, 30 August-3 September, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. pp. 1–21.
- 22
23 Songhurst, B.W. and Kingsley, M. (1993). Life-cycle cost reduction through designing for
24 maintenance, in: *Offshore Technology Conference*, 3-6 May, Houston, Texas, pp. 537–546.
- 25
26 Sprowso, M.E., Pugh, P. and Nekhom, M. (1979). Decision tree analysis of exploration activities, in:
27 *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and Evaluation Symposium*, 11-13 February, Dallas, Texas, USA,
28 8 pages.
- 29
30 Stephenson, T., Valle, J.E. and Riera-Palou, X. (2011). Modeling the relative GHG emissions of
31 conventional and shale gas production. *Environmental Science & Technology* 45(24), 10757–
32 10764.
- 33
34 Steuten, B. and Onna, M. van. (2016). Reduce project and life cycle cost with TCP flowline, in:
35 *Offshore Technology Conference Asia*, 22-25 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–10.
- 36
37 Strantzali, E. and Aravossis, K. (2016). Decision making in renewable energy investments: A review.
38 *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 55, 885–898.
- 39
40 Streeter, J. and Moody, R. (2011). Improved NPV using shallow water subsea systems to achieve
41 early first oil and reduce CAPEX, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Brasil*, 4-6 October, Rio
42 de Janeiro, Brazil, pp. 1–9.
- 43
44 Suslick, S.B. and Furtado, R. (2001). Quantifying the value of technological, environmental and
45 financial gain in decision models for offshore oil exploration. *Journal of Petroleum Science and*
46 *Engineering* 32(2-4), 115–125.
- 47
48 Suslick, S.B., Furtado, R. and Nepomuceno, F. (2001). Integrating technological and financial
49 uncertainty for offshore oil exploration: an application of multiobjective decision analysis, in:
50 *SPE Hydrocarbon Economics and Evaluation Symposium*, 2-3 April, Dallas, Texas, USA, pp. 1–
51 9.
- 52
53 Tague, J.R. and Hollman, G.F. (2000). Downhole video: A cost/benefit analysis, in: *SPE/AAPG*
54 *Western Regional Meeting*, 19-22 June, Long Beach, California. pp. 1–6.
- 55
56 Thoft-christensen, P. (2008). Modelling user costs in life-cycle cost-benefit (LCCB) analysis, in: *The*
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- IFIP International Conference on Reliability and Optimization of Structural Systems*, August 6-9, Mexico City, Mexico, pp. 1–10.
- Thoft-Christensen, P. (2012). Infrastructures and life-cycle cost-benefit analysis. *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering* 8(5), 507–516.
- Trujillo, J.A., Rincon Rojas, R. and Jimenez Carreno, L. (2013). Insertion problems in tandem progressing cavity (PC) pumps, solving this on a decision tree, in: *SPE Artificial Lift Conference-Americas*, 21-22 May, Cartagena, Colombia, pp. 1–8.
- Verre, F., Giubileo, A. and Cadegiani, C. (2009). Asset life-cycle opex modelling with montecarlo simulation to reduce uncertainties and to improve field exploitation, in: *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 4-7 October, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, pp. 1–6.
- Vinodh, S. and Jeya Girubha, R. (2012). PROMETHEE based sustainable concept selection. *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 36(11), 5301–5308.
- Virine, L. (2008). Judgment elicitation process for multi-criteria decision-Making in oil and gas industry, in: *International Petroleum Technology Conference*, 3-5 December, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. pp. 1–8.
- Vorarat, S., Al-hajj, A. and Robert, T. (2004). Developing a model to suit life cycle costing analysis for assets in the oil and gas industry, in: *SPE Asia Pacific Conference on Integrated Modelling for Asset Management*, 29-30 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–5.
- Weber, C.L. and Clavin, C. (2012). Life cycle carbon footprint of shale gas: review of evidence and implications. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46(11), 5688–5695.
- Winkel, J.D. (1996). Use of life cycle costing in new and mature applications, in: *SPE European Production Operations Conference and Exhibition*, 16-17 April, Stavanger, Norway, pp. 239–242.
- World Energy Council (2017). *World Energy Issues Monitor 2017*. www.worldenergy.org, pp. 1–150.
- Wright, J.R., Arim, K.A. and Kennedy, S. (2014). A case study detailing the design, planning, installation and cost and environmental benefit analysis of a reinforced thermoplastic pipe pulled through the inside of an existing offshore steel flow line in the east Malaysia Samarang field, in: *Offshore Technology Conference Asia*, 25-28 March, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. pp. 1–7.
- Zadeh, L.A. (1965) Fuzzy sets. *Information Control* 8, 338–353.
- Zavala-Araiza, D., Allen, D.T., Harrison, M., George, F.C. and Jersey, G.R. (2015). Allocating methane emissions to natural gas and oil production from shale formations. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering* 3(3), 492–498.
- Zeleny, M. and Cochrane, J. (1982). *Multiple criteria decision making*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Zhu, D. and Arcos, D. (2008). Technical, economic and risk analysis for a multilateral well, in: *SPE Russian Oil and Gas Technical Conference and Exhibition*, 28-30 October, Moscow, Russia, pp. 1–17.
- Zio, E. (1996). On the use of the analytic hierarchy process in the aggregation of expert judgments. *Reliability Engineering and Systems Safety* 53, 127–138.
- Zoveidavianpoor, M., Samsuri, A. and Shadzadeh, S.R. (2012). Fuzzy logic in candidate-well selection for hydraulic fracturing in oil and gas wells: A critical review. *International Journal of Physical Sciences* 7(26), 4049-4060.

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

- Systematic review on the current state-of the-art and future perspectives of various decision-making support methods applied to the upstream oil and gas sector;
- To identify publication sources that contain literature on the topic;
- To propose a framework to classify the literature according to a set of assessment criteria;
- To identify the most commonly used decision analytics methods for upstream oil and gas operations, e.g. exploration, development and production;
- To gain better insight about upstream oil and gas business activities with well-informed decision-making.




Figure 1. Classification framework for decision-making support methods applied to the upstream oil and gas sector.





Figure 1. Number of publications during the past four decades.



**** Figure 3****

Figure 3. The lifecycle phases of an oil and gas field.




Figure 4. Distribution of decision-making methods applied to the upstream sector during the past four decades.

Table 1. Distribution of studies based on oil and gas field's lifecycle phases.

developmental phase	# of papers	References
Exploration	13	Sprowso <i>et al.</i> (1979); Erdogan <i>et al.</i> (2001); Suslick and Furtado (2001); Abhulimen (2009); Gomez <i>et al.</i> (2009); Jafarizadeh and Bratvold (2009); Verre <i>et al.</i> (2009); Shrivastva <i>et al.</i> (2012); Zoveidavianpoor <i>et al.</i> (2012); Burlini and Araruna (2013); Lopes and Almeida (2013); Bello <i>et al.</i> (2016); Guedes and Santos (2016);
Development	19	Methven (1993); Dear <i>et al.</i> (1995); Iyer <i>et al.</i> (1998); Denney (1999); Mudford (2000); Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001); Goldsmith <i>et al.</i> (2001); Begg <i>et al.</i> (2002); Denney (2002); Finch <i>et al.</i> (2002); Ferreira <i>et al.</i> (2004); Brainard (2006); Cullick <i>et al.</i> (2007); Ghazi <i>et al.</i> (2008); Zhu and Arcos (2008); Angert <i>et al.</i> (2011); Gong <i>et al.</i> (2011); Streeter and Moody (2011); Adam and Ghosh (2016);
Production	17	Jentsch Jr and Marrs (1988); Cheldi <i>et al.</i> (1997); Aycaguer <i>et al.</i> (2001); Castro <i>et al.</i> (2002); Cullick <i>et al.</i> (2003); Hegstad <i>et al.</i> (2005); Islam and Powell (2005); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2008); Abhulimen (2009); Li <i>et al.</i> (2009); Verre <i>et al.</i> (2009); Kayrbekova and Markeset (2010); Chen <i>et al.</i> (2011); Nam <i>et al.</i> (2011); Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011); Hernandez <i>et al.</i> (2013); Ghani <i>et al.</i> (2015);
Life extension	2	Chitwood <i>et al.</i> (2004); Shafiee <i>et al.</i> (2016)
Abandonment / Decomission	2	Poremski (1998); Fowler <i>et al.</i> (2014).

Joshi (2003)	✓			
Chitwood <i>et al.</i> (2004)		✓		
Ferreira <i>et al.</i> (2004)				✓
Vorarat <i>et al.</i> (2004)		✓		
Hegstad <i>et al.</i> (2005)			✓	
Islam and Powell (2005)	✓			
Brainard (2006)	✓			
Cullick <i>et al.</i> (2007)	✓			
Lev and Murphy (2007)				✓
Moan (2007)			✓	
Bahmannia (2008)			✓	
Ghazi <i>et al.</i> (2008)			✓	
Kayrbekova and Markeset (2008)		✓		
Liu and Ford (2008)	✓			
Orimo <i>et al.</i> (2008)	✓			
Virine (2008)				✓
Zhu and Arcos (2008)		✓		
Abhulimen (2009)			✓	
Bybee (2009)				✓
Gomez <i>et al.</i> (2009)				✓
Jafarizadeh and Bratvold (2009)		✓		
Li <i>et al.</i> (2009)		✓		
Verre <i>et al.</i> (2009)		✓		
Kayrbekova and Markeset (2010)		✓		
Ratnayaka and Markese (2010)				✓
Pinturier <i>et al.</i> (2010)	✓			
Angert <i>et al.</i> (2011)		✓		
Chen <i>et al.</i> (2011)		✓		
Gong <i>et al.</i> (2011)			✓	
Kayrbekova <i>et al.</i> (2011)		✓		
Nam <i>et al.</i> (2011)		✓		
Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011)		✓		
Stephenson <i>et al.</i> (2011)			✓	
Streeter and Moody (2011)		✓		
Burnham <i>et al.</i> (2012)			✓	
Goodwin <i>et al.</i> (2012)			✓	
Grosse-Sommer <i>et al.</i> (2012)			✓	

Schulze <i>et al.</i> (2012)								✓										
Shrivastva <i>et al.</i> (2012)								✓										
Weber and Clavin (2012)					✓													
Zoveidavianpoor <i>et al.</i> (2012)																		✓
Burlini and Araruna (2013)				✓														
Hernandez <i>et al.</i> (2013)				✓														
Lopes and Almeida (2013)										✓								
Pettersen <i>et al.</i> (2013)					✓													
Pierce and Wills (2013)																		✓
Sheremetov <i>et al.</i> (2013)																		✓
Trujillo <i>et al.</i> (2013)								✓										
Fergestad <i>et al.</i> (2014)					✓													
Fowler <i>et al.</i> (2014)																		✓
Jeong <i>et al.</i> (2014)				✓														
Kullawan <i>et al.</i> (2014)									✓									
Lilien <i>et al.</i> (2014)					✓													
Maddah <i>et al.</i> (2014)	✓																	
Marten and Gatzen (2014)				✓														
Sandler <i>et al.</i> (2014)					✓													
Siveter <i>et al.</i> (2014)					✓													
Wright <i>et al.</i> (2014)		✓																
Chilukuri <i>et al.</i> (2015)				✓														
Chun <i>et al.</i> (2015)					✓													
de Wardt and Peterson (2015)				✓														
Ghani <i>et al.</i> (2015)				✓														
Oruganti <i>et al.</i> (2015)				✓														
Silitonga (2015)			✓															
Zavala-Araiza <i>et al.</i> (2015)					✓													
Adam and Ghosh (2016)					✓													
Bello <i>et al.</i> (2016)																		✓
Guedes and Santos (2016)			✓															
Johannknecht <i>et al.</i> (2016a)				✓														
Johannknecht <i>et al.</i> (2016b)				✓														
Ortiz-Volcan <i>et al.</i> (2016)				✓														
Seo <i>et al.</i> (2016)		✓																
Shafiee <i>et al.</i> (2016)		✓																
Steuten and Onna (2016)				✓														
Total number of papers	3	14	4	39	18	4	10	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	
Percentage of papers (%)	2.7	12.7	3.6	35.5	16.4	3.6	9.1	0.9	3.6	4.5	0	0	0	0	0.9	0.9	5.5	

Table 3. Distribution of studies based on geographical location of case studies.

Reference	Aim of study	Case study location
Songhurst and Kingsley (1993)	LCC reduction through design for maintenance	North Sea
Dear <i>et al.</i> (1995)	Mud system selection	Nigeria
Lassen and Syvertsen (1996)	Fatigue reliability and LCC analysis of mooring chains	North Sea
Winkel (1996)	Material selection	North Sea
Cheldi <i>et al.</i> (1997)	Material selection	Mediterranean Sea
Tague and Hollman (2000)	CBA of downhole video	USA
Aycaguer <i>et al.</i> (2001)	EOR with injection of CO ₂ feasibility analysis	USA
Gerbacia and Al-Shammari (2001)	Selection of strategic reservoir planning option	Kuwait
Suslick and Furtado (2001)	Decision models for offshore oil exploration	Brazil
Chitwood <i>et al.</i> (2004)	Evaluations of deepwater marginal field developments	GOM
Islam and Powell (2005)	CBA of flowline replacement	Middle East
Lev and Murphy (2007)	Project portfolio selection	Canada
Orimo <i>et al.</i> (2008)	CBA to determine the design of FLNG storage size	Indonesia
Bahmannia (2008)	ELCA of gas treatment plant	Iran
Li <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Minimize expected LCC for ice-resistance platforms	China
Ortiz-Volcan and Iskandar (2011)	LCC analysis for production technologies in heavy oil well construction	Venezuela
Streeter and Moody (2011)	Maximizing NPV of uneconomical fields using shallow water subsea systems	GOM
Grosse-Sommer <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Evaluating the sustainability of completion fluid	North Sea
Shrivastva <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Optimizing borehole imaging for tight gas exploration	Oman
Hernandez <i>et al.</i> (2013)	LCC analysis for a nitrogen over hydraulic pumping unit	Colombia
Lopes and Almeida (2013)	Selecting a portfolio of oil and gas exploration projects	Brazil
Pierce and Wills (2013)	Assessing risk for Permian Basin tank battery	USA
Maddah <i>et al.</i> (2014)	An optimization model to define a production sharing contract between the government and oil companies	Mediterranean Sea
Chun <i>et al.</i> (2015)	Reservoir management through ELCA	Peru
Adam and Ghosh (2016)	Material selection	Brunei
Ortiz-Volcan <i>et al.</i> (2016)	Cost optimization of a thermal recovery project	Kuwait
Shafiee <i>et al.</i> (2016)	CBA of water deluge system for life extension	W/A

Note: The abbreviation W/A means West Africa, GoM means Gulf of Mexico, and FLNG means Floating Liquefied Natural Gas, EOR means Enhanced Oil Recovery, and NPV means Net Present Value.