Seismic Uncertainty Workshop (A)

Instructions

Please read the questions carefully and answer briefly in the spaces provided. Many thanks for your participation.

Questions about your interpretation

1) Did you have an analogue in mind while interpreting the seismic image? *Briefly describe what.*

2) What were the critical observations that influenced your interpretation?

2.1) What types of features were most critical to you? E.g. faults or horizons?

3) Did you try out any other interpretations for the seismic image? *Briefly describe.*

3.1) *If not*, can you think of any other interpretations just now? *Briefly describe.*

4) *Think carefully through your interpretation.* Did you approach the interpretation exercise with geological models in mind, then decide which fits the data best (model-driven approach); or did you interpret the seismic image by identifying as many geological features as possible, which then built up to a geological model (data-driven approach)?

5) Did you consider the geological evolution of your interpretation?

If yes;

5.1) Did you find it challenging to work out the geological evolution?

5.2) Which area(s) of the seismic image did you find most difficult to fit into your geological evolution?

5.3) How confident are you that your geological evolution **honours all of the data**?

5.4) How confident are you that your geological evolution **is kinematically valid**?

5.5) Were you more or less confident in your interpretation after considering the geological evolution?

5.6) Do you think that considering the geological evolution was beneficial to getting a valid interpretation?

5.7) Did you find that considering the geological evolution challenged or validated your first impressions (or neither)?

If no;

5.8) Do you think that considering the geological evolution would have helped?

5.9) Why did you not consider the geological evolution? (E.g. I ran out of time, it didn't occur to me, I didn't think I needed it to understand my interpretation…)

6) What is your overall confidence in today's interpretation given that you only have one 2D seismic image (instead of all the data that you would normally have)?

Questions about seismic interpretation workflows

1) Can you give a brief outline of your normal seismic interpretation workflow (from your experience in industry generally)?

2) What types of data do you usually have access to?

3) At any part of the workflow do you ever consider seismic data by itself, with no regional / contextual information?

3.1) *If yes,* how long is it until other information is brought into the workflow?

4) How often do you use a single line to build a template model (cartoon) to aid your 3D interpretation?

5) In your normal workflow do you check the geological evolution of your interpretation?

5.1) *If not,* why not?

5.2) *If yes,* at what stage?

6) Are you prompted (in any way) to consider the geological evolution of your interpretation during your normal workflow?

7) Do you routinely try out different models for a given seismic dataset in your workflow (i.e. alternative interpretations of the data)? *At what stage?*

8) Apart from geological structure, what else do you investigate during 'seismic interpretation'?