

EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL CARBON DIOXIDE
SEQUESTRATION AND ENHANCED OIL RECOVERY
IN THE NORTHERN MALAY BASIN AREA

NURUL FATIMAH AZ-ZAHARAH MOHD ARIS

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Petroleum)

School of Chemical and Energy Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JANUARY 2019

To my parents and family,
Thank you for everything
To my lecturers,
Thank you for the knowledge that has been passed on to me
To my friends,
Thank you for not giving up on me.
I dedicate this work to all of you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thank my family, especially my parents, for helping me, guiding me, giving me their emotional supports and also for not giving up on me during my downturn days.

Next, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Radzuan for accepting me as his student, and for giving me ideas and guidance towards completing this project. I would also like to thank all the lecturers from the Petroleum Engineering Department for guiding me and teaching me throughout these 4 semesters of my study. Without their guidance, I will not be able to finish my course of program.

Lastly, I would like to thank my seniors and peers for helping me and acknowledging my hard work in completing this program.

Thank you.

ABSTRACT

The topic of climate change has been increasingly debated around the world as of date. One of the main causes of climate change is the increase in global warming, which is directly caused by the rise in the amount greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere, which mostly comprises of carbon dioxide (CO₂) gas. One of the ways in order to lessen the amount of CO₂ gas in the atmosphere is through CO₂ sequestration. This study aims to evaluate the potential of CO₂ sequestration in the Malay Basin. By utilizing a set of field data and a static model that is obtained from previous studies of **Field N** in the Northern Malay Basin Area, a reservoir simulation dynamic modelling is done by using the Roxar-Tempest VIEW™ ver. 8.3 software. The main objectives of the simulation are to determine the amount of gas that can be stored in **Field N** in the Northern Malay Basin area through the CO₂ sequestration and enhanced oil recovery (CO₂-EOR) process using dynamic modelling, and also to determine the amount of oil production in **Field N** using the CO₂-EOR process using dynamic modelling. The outcome of this research are as follows; i) The amount of CO₂ gas that can be stored in **Field N** through CO₂ injection process is about 137 Mscf; (ii) The total amount of oil production of **Field N** through the process of CO₂-EOR ranges from 190 MMstb to 230 MMstb; (iii) The amount of oil production through the process of CO₂-EOR has an increment of about more than 20% as compared to both the natural depletion and water injection simulation; and (iv) As the gas injection rate increases, the amount of CO₂ gas that can be stored also increases. It was deduced that for the CO₂-EOR process, the injected CO₂ gas behaves in a way that it follows the *multiple contact miscibility* process, in which that it sweeps the residual oil towards the producing wells.

ABSTRAK

Topik perubahan iklim semakin diperdebatkan di seluruh dunia sehingga kini. Salah satu punca utama perubahan iklim adalah kerana peningkatan pemanasan global, yang secara langsung disebabkan oleh kenaikan jumlah gas rumah hijau (GHG) di dalam atmosfera, yang sebahagian besarnya terdiri daripada gas karbon dioksida (CO₂). Salah satu cara untuk mengurangkan jumlah gas CO₂ di atmosfera adalah melalui proses penyerapan dan penyimpanan gas CO₂ ini. Kajian ini adalah bertujuan untuk menilai potensi penyerapan dan penyimpanan gas CO₂ di kawasan Malay Basin (Lembangan Melayu). Dengan menggunakan satu set data dan satu model statik yang diperoleh daripada kajian yang pernah dilakukan sebelum ini di **Field N** di Utara Malay Basin, simulasi dinamik model reservoir telah dilakukan dengan menggunakan perisian Roxar-Tempest VIEW™ (ver. 8.3). Objektif utama simulasi ini adalah untuk menentukan jumlah gas CO₂ yang boleh disimpan di **Field N** di kawasan Utara Malay Basin melalui proses pemencilan CO₂ dan perolehan minyak tertingkat (CO₂-EOR) menggunakan pemodelan dinamik, dan juga untuk menentukan jumlah pengeluaran minyak di **Field N** menggunakan proses CO₂-EOR menggunakan pemodelan dinamik. Hasil kajian ini adalah seperti berikut; i) Jumlah gas CO₂ yang boleh disimpan di **Field N** melalui proses suntikan CO₂ adalah berjumlah sebanyak 137 Mscf; (ii) Jumlah pengeluaran minyak di **Field N** melalui proses CO₂-EOR berjumlah dari 190 MMstb hingga 230 MMstb; (iii) Jumlah pengeluaran minyak melalui proses CO₂-EOR meningkat sebanyak lebih dari 20% berbanding dengan simulasi semulajadi dan suntikan air; dan (iv) Apabila kadar suntikan gas meningkat, jumlah gas CO₂ yang boleh disimpan juga meningkat. Dapat disimpulkan bahawa gas CO₂ yang disuntik bertindak dengan cara ia mengikuti proses *multiple contact miscibility*, di mana ia berjaya membantu menolak sisa minyak di dalam reservoir ke arah telaga pengeluaran.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITLE	PAGE
	TITLE PAGE	i
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	ix
	LIST OF FIGURES	x
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xiv
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background of the Study	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	6
	1.3 Objectives of the Study	9
	1.4 Scopes of the Study	9
	1.5 Significance of the Study	10
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	11
	2.1 Introduction	11
	2.2 Carbon Dioxide Sequestration	14
	2.3 Malay Basin	18
	2.4 CO ₂ Sequestration and Enhanced Oil Recovery (CO ₂ – EOR)	25
CHAPTER 3	METHODOLOGY	29
	3.1 Introduction	29
	3.2 Data Collection and Static Model	30
	3.3 CO ₂ Gas Storage and CO ₂ – EOR	30

3.4	Dynamic Modelling: Roxar – Tempest VIEW™ Simulation	31
CHAPTER 4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	37
4.1	Introduction	37
4.2	Natural Depletion and Water Injection Simulation	40
4.3	CO ₂ Gas Storage	43
4.4	CO ₂ – EOR Production	45
4.4.1	Cases 2 – 5 Gas Injectors, 10 Producer Wells, and 6 Water Injectors	45
4.4.2	Cases 2, 3, 4 – 5 Gas Injectors, 10 Producer Wells, 6 Water Injectors, Different Injection Rates	47
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
5.1	Conclusions	51
5.2	Recommendations	52
REFERENCES		55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	List of Ranking or Sedimentary Basins in Malaysia	5
2.1	Potential Emission Reduction with Mitigation Action, modified from the Biennial Update Report Submissions from Non-Annex 1 Parties	13
2.2	Basin Scale Assessment Criteria of Evaluation of Potential CO ₂ storage in geological formations in Malaysia	23
4.1	The amount of total oil production for all cases for a period of 30 years of production	50

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Carbon Capture and Storage – Readiness Index (CCS – RI) globally	4
1.2	Potential injection site for CO ₂ storage in Malay Basin	8
2.1	A schematic representation of the carbon capture and storage process with numbering indicators of the four systems of CCS process	15
2.2	Carbon Dioxide capture systems	15
2.3	Five suggested methods of CO ₂ injection to ensure minimum costs, leakage and environmental impacts	17
2.4	Fold domains within the Malay Basin	19
2.5	Fold domains within the Malay Basin	19
2.6	Schematic SW–NE cross-section of the Malay Basin	20
2.7	Potential injection site for CO ₂ storage in Malay Basin	21
2.8	A cross-section on the pathway of how CO ₂ and water is used to flush the residual oil	26
3.1	Simplified methodology explanation	31
3.2	The cell grid model of Field N prior to	42

	dynamic modelling	
3.3	The ternary phase diagram of Field N prior to dynamic modelling	34
3.4	The diagram of the reservoir depth (in m) of Field N prior to dynamic modelling	34
3.5	The oil saturation diagram of Field N prior to dynamic modelling	35
3.6	The gas saturation diagram of Field N prior to dynamic modelling	35
4.1	10 producing wells with 6 water injectors distributed across Field N for the water injection simulation in an Oil Saturation Model (Case 1)	38
4.2	10 producing wells, 6 water injectors, and 5 gas injector well across Field N for the GI simulation in a Gas Saturation Model (Case 2, 3 and 4)	39
4.3	10 producing wells, 6 water injectors and 10 gas injectors across Field N for the GI simulation in an Oil Saturation Model (Case 5)	39
4.4	Natural Depletion Simulation – Oil Production Rate (top left), Gas Production rate (top right), Water Production Rate (bottom left) and Bottomhole Pressure (bottom right) for 30 years of production period	41
4.5	Natural Depletion and Water Injection Simulation – Oil in Place (top) and Oil Production Rate (bottom) for 30 years of production period	42

4.6	Gas Injection Rate vs Gas Production Rates for Case 6 (top) and the Total Amount of Gas Injected vs Total Amount of Gas Produced for Case 6 (bottom) for 30 years of production period	44
4.7	Gas Injection Simulation – Oil Production Rate (top left), Gas Production rate (top right), Water Production Rate (bottom left) and Bottomhole Pressure (bottom right) for 30 years of production period	46
4.8	A comparison of the total amount of oil production for Primary Recovery, Secondary Recovery, and for Gas Injection process with different injection rates for 30 years of production period	48
4.9	A comparison of the total amount of oil production for Primary Recovery, Secondary Recovery, and all cases of Gas Injections for 30 years of production period	49

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCS	-	Carbon Capture and Storage / Sequestration
CH ₄	-	Methane
CO ₂ -EOR	-	Carbon Dioxide Enhanced Oil Recovery
CO ₂	-	Carbon Dioxide
EOR	-	Enhanced Oil Recovery
GHG	-	Greenhouse Gases
IFT	-	Interfacial Tension
IPCC	-	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MCM	-	Multiple Contact Miscibility
N ₂ O	-	Nitrous Oxide
NASA	-	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
UNFCC	-	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
US-DOE	-	United States Department of Energy
US-SCNGO	-	United States Strategic Center for Natural Gas and Oil
WAG	-	Water Alternating Gas

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Field N – Natural Depletion	81
B	Field N – Case 2: Gas Injection (5 GI, 5000sm ³ /day)	83
C	Field N – Case 3: Gas Injection (5GI, 10000 sm ³ /day)	88
D	Field N – Case 4: Gas Injection (5GI, 15000 sm ³ /day)	93
E	Field N – Case 5: Gas Injection (10 GI, 15000 sm ³ /day)	98
F	Field N – Case 6 (CCS): Gas Injection (10 GI, 15000 sm ³ /day)	105
G	Field N – Base Case (10 Producer Wells & 6 Water Injectors)	112

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The topic of climate change has been widely debated around the world, ranging from its causes and effects, the mitigation procedures, and also on the hundreds of projects combatting the problem. According to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol treaty, which is an extension of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), emissions of anthropogenic greenhouse gases (GHGs), mainly carbon dioxide (CO₂), are needed to be controlled in order to extenuate the occurrence of global warming. In addition to this, the 2015 Paris Agreement (*Accord de Paris*) was conducted, and it consists of the mitigation of the greenhouse gas emissions, adaptation and finance, which will commence in the year 2020. The main objectives of the agreement are as follows;

“To maintain the increasing temperature of the earth by 2°C above the pre-industrial levels and to limit the temperature increase by 1.5°C above the pre-industrial levels,

“To increase the ability to adapt the impacts of climate change in such a way that it will not in any way or form, harm the food production,

“To ensure that the flows of finance are consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development”

(Accord de Paris, 2015).

It was also stated by NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) that the average surface temperature of our planet has soared up to about 1.1°C since the 19th century, and it is widely caused by anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. In 2016, eight of the months of the year (from January to September), were the warmest months that was recorded in the warmest year of date. Since the oil and gas sector have been one of the major contributors for the emissions of CO₂ gas, (Hamilton, 1998), it is vital for us human beings with conscience to at least mitigate the emissions of CO₂, in order for us to lessen the effect of climate change. There are numerous methods of decrease the amount of CO₂ in the world, the most well-known being the process of CO₂ sequestration.

The term CO₂ sequestration refers to the process of CO₂ capture and storage (CCS). Dated back since 1972, the process was first used as a method to enhance oil recovery (EOR) (Richey, 2013). There are basically three different kinds of the CO₂ sequestration process: terrestrial, geologic, and mineralization. In this study, the

geologic sequestration process is examined. Geologic sequestration is the term that is used for permanently storing the captured CO₂ gaseous in subsurface structures such as oil reservoirs, basins, basalt formations and also aqueous saline formations. Most of the geological media that is ideal for CO₂ storage are located in sedimentary basins (eg: deep saline aquifers, coal beds). However, a screening process should be done in order to ensure the safety and longevity of the potential CO₂ storage.

Enhanced Oil Recovery (EOR) is referred to as the tertiary process of oil recovery operations, the first two being (i) Primary Recovery (natural depletion), and (ii) Secondary Recovery (waterflooding, gas injections). EOR consists of processes such as injecting miscible gaseous (eg: CO₂, etc.), chemical injections, and also thermal injections in order to displace the amount of oil left in the depleted reservoirs (Willhite, 1998). EOR will be done when the first and secondary recovery becomes economically unfeasible. The process of Carbon Dioxide – Enhanced Oil Recovery or (CO₂–EOR) on the other hand is the process of which CO₂ gas is injected into the reservoir for storage, and also for sweeping the depleted oil left in the reservoirs. It was reported that the amount of oil recovery that has been obtained through CO₂–EOR purposes to be around 179000 BOPD, and is still increasing up until now. According to the Global CCS Institute, the CCS Readiness Index (CCS-RI), Malaysia has a CCS-RI of about 32%, which falls just a few steps from South Korea which ranks at about 38% (*Figure 1.1*). The countries with good CCS-RI numbers are Canada, the United States and also Norway, all

of which has a value of around 68% – 72%. China, the Netherlands, Denmark, Germany and Japan come in latter with good CCS-RI numbers, all of which are ranked at more than 50%.




Figure 1.1: Carbon Capture and Storage – Readiness Index (CCS – RI) globally (Global CCS Institute, 2018)

As of now, Malaysia has been known as one of the highest oil-producing countries in the world, and that most of the sources are from sedimentary basins. A previous study has shown that there are 14 identified sedimentary basins in Malaysia that was found to be quite ideal for potential CO₂ storage. The first four basins that have the highest score obtained through selective screening and ranking processes are the Malay Basin, Central Luconia Province, West Baram Delta, and lastly the Balingian Province. It was stated that the Malay Basin warrants extra attention as it is ranked as the basin

which has the most potential for offshore CO₂ storage. The different evaluation criteria for the screening process are as follows (modified from Bachu, 2003): Tectonic setting, faulting intensity, reservoir seal pair, depth, size, geothermal, hydrogeology, maturity, hydrocarbon potential, onshore/offshore, accessibility, infrastructure and also climate.

Table 1.1: List of Ranking or Sedimentary Basins in Malaysia

Rank, R	Basin, k	Score
1	Malay Basin	0.8113
2	Central Luconia Province	0.7356
3	West Baram Delta	0.7041
4	Balingian Province	0.6938
5	Sabah Basin	0.6864
6	East Baram Delta	0.6260
7	Straits of Melaka	0.6200
8	Penyu Basin	0.5554
9	Tatau Province	0.4938
10	West Luconia Province	0.4553
11	Tinjar Province	0.4200
12	Northeast Sabah Basin	0.3543
13	Southeast Sabah Basin	0.3370
14	North Luconia Province	0.2659

(Hasbollah et al., 2015)

In this study, a detailed evaluation of potential CO₂ sequestration and enhanced oil recovery in the northern Malay basin area were conducted.

1.2 Problem Statement

Carbon dioxide sequestration mainly utilizes the injection of CO₂ gas into a depleted reservoir. An example of this project was located in a depleted gas reservoir in North Italy. The difference in between its physical and chemical properties and changes in the reservoir were simulated to investigate its effects on the reservoir's total storage capacity (Calabrese, 2005). A CO₂ injection process is supposedly effective in reservoirs with a depth of more than 2500ft, as the CO₂ gas will be in its supercritical state, with API oil gravity more than 25° and the remaining oil saturation of more than 20%. During the process of CO₂ injection, the CO₂ gas will react with the formation rocks available, such as in dolomite formations, of which, in turn, will affect the permeability of the composition due to the rocks dissolution and precipitation of reaction products. There are several factors affecting the rate and the interactions between the CO₂ gas and the rock formations, such as the pressure, temperature and the brine composition of the rock formations, the CO₂ gas injection rate, and also the overall injection scheme. A previous study had shown that in a CO₂ gas injection with dolomite formations, the temperature, injection and flow rate doesn't have major impacts on the permeability of the dolomite core sample; the damage that was done towards the permeability of the sample was mostly done by the calcium carbonate (CaCO₃), and the precipitations obtained as a resultant of the reaction between silicate minerals in the dolomite and the CO₂ gas injected.

In 2016, a theoretical storage capacity assessment of the Malay Basin was done using the volumetric method for CO₂ gas capacity calculations in deep saline formations (*Hasbollah, 2016*). The method that was used was proposed by the U.S. Department of Energy (US-DOE), and it was planned for external use in assessing the potential of CO₂ storage in reservoirs at both regional and national scales. The following equation is the volumetric formula that was used in order to calculate the CO₂ gas storage resource mass estimate, Gco₂, for geologic storage in saline formation (by considering the boundary conditions of saline aquifers are open);

$$Gco_2 = A_t \times \phi_t \times h_g \times \rho \times E_{saline} \quad (1)$$

Where;

A_t = Total geographical area of the basin being assessed for CO₂ storage,

ϕ_t = Total porosity in volume in net thickness,

h_g = Gross thickness of the saline formation,

ρ = Density of CO₂ at the formation temperature

From the study, it was stated that the amount of CO₂ storage capacity estimation for the Malay Basin was at about 84 Gt and it was located in Groups D and E (*Figure 1.2*) sediments, which are located at a depth of 1000 m to 1500 m, and fulfils the requirement

for a safe CO₂ storage unit which requires an average porosity of 17% and a permeability of 40mD (Kartikasurja, 2008).




Figure 1.2: Potential injection site for CO₂ storage in Malay Basin (Hasbollah & Junin, 2016)

Since the study that was done by *Hasbollah* on the calculation of G_{CO_2} utilizes theoretical generalized data, thus, in this study, an experimental CO₂ gas storage capacity assessment will be done by running a 3-D dynamic modelling with data samples obtained from a previous study that was done in **Field N** in the Northern Malay Basin Area. The amount of CO₂ gas stored in the field will be calculated from the amount of CO₂ gas injected and the amount of CO₂ gas produced from the field. The storage capacity assessment will be done by running a 3-D dynamic model of **Field**

N in the Northern Malay Basin area using the Roxar–Tempest VIEW™ software.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are as follows:

- i. To determine the amount of CO₂ gas that can be stored in **Field N** in the Northern Malay Basin area through the CO₂ – EOR process using dynamic modelling
- ii. To estimate the amount of oil production in **Field N** using the CO₂ – EOR process using dynamic modelling

1.4 Scopes of the Study

The scopes of the study which are based from the objectives are as follows:

- i. Studying the amount of CO₂ gas that can be stored in **Field N** in the Northern Malay Basin area through the CO₂ – EOR process using dynamic modelling
- ii. Studying the amount of oil production in Field N through the CO₂ – EOR process using dynamic modelling

- iii. Comparing the amount of oil production in **Field N** through Primary Recovery, Secondary Recovery and through CO₂ – EOR simulation
- iv. Examining the effects of different rates of CO₂ gas injection towards the amount of CO₂ gas stored and the amount of oil produced in **Field N**.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study highlights the major problem that the world is facing right now, which is the ever-existing climate change. Thus, one of the ways in order for us to contribute in combatting the phenomenon is by mitigating the CO₂ gas emissions through the process of CO₂ sequestration. As Malaysia has already ratified both the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol treaty, thus, it is quite vital for us to conduct an in depth analysis towards the ‘readiness’ of Malaysia in CO₂ sequestration. In this study, a continuation of assessing the Malay Basin as a potential for long term CO₂ storage was done. By running a dynamic model of a particular field located in the Malay Basin in Malaysia, we can theoretically analyse the technical aspect of CO₂ sequestration and also the future of CO₂ – EOR process. This study was also done so that it could provide a basis for policy makers on the future planning of CO₂ capture and storage, not only in Malaysia but also worldwide.

REFERENCES

- Afanasyev, A. A. (2013). Application of the Reservoir Simulator MUFITS for 3D Modelling of CO₂ Storage in Geological Formations. *Energy Procedia*, 40, 365–374.
- Afanasyev, A. A. (2013). Multiphase Compositional Modelling of CO₂ Injection under Subcritical Conditions: The Impact of Dissolution and Phase Transitions Between Liquid and Gaseous CO₂ on Reservoir Temperature. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 19, 731–742.
- Afanasyev, A., & Melnik, O. (2016). Validation of the MUFITS Reservoir Simulator Against Standard CO₂ Storage Benchmarks and History-matched Models of the Ketzin Pilot Site. *Energy Procedia*, 97
- Ahmed Satti, I., Wan Yusoff, W. I., & Ghosh, D. (2016). Overpressure in the Malay Basin and prediction methods. *Geofluids*, 16(2), 301–313.
- Ariffin A. (2017) Potential of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Through Carbon Dioxide Enhanced Oil Recovery (CO₂ - EOR). M. Petroleum Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai.

- Titley D.W. (2016) Attribution of Extreme Weather Events in the Context of Climate Change. Washington, D.C.: *National Academies Press*.
- Auerbach, D. I, Caulfield, J. A, Adams, E. E. and Herzog, H. J., 1997. “Impacts Of Ocean CO₂ Disposal On Marine Life: A Toxicological Assessment Integrating Constant-Concentration Laboratory Assay Data With Variable-Concentration Field Exposure”, *Environmental Modeling and Assessment 2*: 333- 343.
- Bachu, S. (2003) Screening and Ranking of Sedimentary Basins for Sequestration of CO₂ in Geological Media in response to Climate Change, *Environmental Geology*, 44, 277– 289
- Calabrese, M., Masserano, F., Div, P., Blunt, M., & London, I. C. (2005). Simulation of Physical-Chemical Processes During Carbon Dioxide Sequestration in Geological Structures, 9–12.
- Caulfield, J. A., Adams, E. E., Auerbach, D. I., and Herzog, H.J, 1997. “Impacts of Ocean CO₂ Disposal on Marine Life: Probabilistic Plume Exposure Model Used With A Time-Varying Dose-Response Analysis”, *Environmental Modeling and Assessment 2*: 345-353.
- Chong, E. E., Mohamad, W. N. W., Rae, S. F., Lim, L., & Flew, S. (2015). Integrated Static and Dynamic Modelling Workflow for Improved History. *Society of Petroleum Engineers. SPE-176097-MS*

- Duda J.R., Yost A. B., Long R., Dehoratiis Jr. G., Ogunsola O. (2010). Carbon Dioxide Enhanced Oil Recovery – Untapped Domestic Energy Supply and Long Term Carbon Storage Solution. *U.S. Department Of Energy 2010*.
- Emissions, A., & Emitters, G. H. G. (2011). Malaysia and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) – The Paris Agreement. *Trade and Industry Related Emerging Issues Division, MITI (Dec 2017)*
- Hasbollah, A. D. Z. & Junin, R. (2016). A Review on the Basin-Scale Evaluation Framework of Potential Sedimentary Basins for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration. *IOSR Journal of Engineering (IOSRJEN) www.iosrjen.org ISSN, 6(1), 2250–3021*.
- Hashemi Fath, A., & Pouranfard, A.-R. (2014). Evaluation of Miscible And Immiscible CO₂ Injection in One of the Iranian Oil Fields. *Egyptian Journal of Petroleum, 23(3), 255–270*.
- Havercroft, I. A. N. (2018). the Carbon Capture and Storage Readiness Index 2018 Is the World Ready for Carbon Capture and Storage? *Global CCS Institute (2018), 4-15*.
- Herzog, H. J., Caldeira, K., & Adams, E. (2000). Carbon Sequestration via Direct Injection. Retrieved May 1st from https://sequestration.mit.edu/pdf/direct_injection.pdf

- Herzog, H., Eliasson, B., Kaarstad, O., (2000). “Capturing Greenhouse Gases”, *Scientific American (February)*.
- Hill, J. A., & 800, D. K. (1992). Clay Mineralogy In Subsurface Sandstones of Malaysia and the Effects on Petrophysical Properties. *Geol. Soc. Malaysia, Bulletin*, 32, 15–43.
- Holloway, S., Karimjee, A., Akai, M., Pipatti, R., Rypdal, K. (2006). Carbon Dioxide Transport, Injection and Geological Storage, *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories 5*, 5.5 - 5.30
- Jafari, A., & Faltinson, J. (2013). *SPE 167180 Transitioning of Existing CO₂-EOR Projects to Pure CO₂ Storage Projects*. Retrieved May 2nd from <https://www-onepetro-org.ezproxy.utm.my/download/conference-paper/SPE-167180-MS?id=conference-paper%2FSPE-167180-MS>
- Jahangiri, H. R., & Zhang, D. Optimization of Carbon Dioxide Sequestration and Enhanced Oil Recovery in Oil Reservoir. Retrieved March 23rd 2018 from <https://www-onepetro-org.ezproxy.utm.my/download/conference-paper/SPE-133594-MS?id=conference-paper%2FSPE-133594-MS>
- Jalil, M. A. A., Masoudi, R., Darman, N. B., & Othman, M. (2012). Study of the CO₂ Injection, Storage, and Sequestration in Depleted M4 Carbonate Gas Condensate Reservoir, Malaysia. *Carbon Management Technology Conference*, 1–14.

- Jamshidnezhad, M., Iranian, N., & Oil, S. (2009). SPE 119996 Gravity Segregation in Gas Improved Oil Recovery of Tilted Reservoirs. *SPE 119996*, 8–11.
- Juza, M., Moure, B., Lellouche, J.-M., Tonani, M., & Tintoré, J. (2015). From Basin to Sub-Basin Scale Assessment and Intercomparison of Numerical Simulations in The Western Mediterranean Sea. *Journal of Marine Systems*, *149*, 36–49.
- Khan, C., Amin, R., & Madden, G. (2012). Economic Modelling of CO₂ Injection for Enhanced Gas Recovery and Storage: A Reservoir Simulation Study of Operational Parameters. *Energy and Environment Research*, *2*(2), 65.
- Kheshgi, H., De Coninck, H., Kessels, J., Kheshgi, H., De Coninck, H., & Kessels, J. (2012). Carbon Dioxide Capture And Storage: Seven Years After The IPCC Special Report. *Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change*, *17*, 563–567.
- Kit Kong, L. (1996). “Structural Analysis of the Malay Basin”. *Annual Geological Conference '96*. Petronas Research and Scientific Services Sdn.Bhd..
- Kumar, S., Jain, S., Yadav Lamba, B., & Kumar, P. (2017). Epigrammatic Status and Perspective of Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide: Role of TiO₂ As Photocatalyst. *Solar Energy*, *159*, 423–433.

- Kunkel, K. E., Karl, T. R., Easterling, D. R., Redmond, K., Young, J., Yin, X., & Hennon, P. (2013). Probable Maximum Precipitation and Climate Change. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *40*(7), 1402–1408.
- Leung, D. Y. C., Caramanna, G., & Maroto-Valer, M. M. (2014). An Overview of Current Status of Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage Technologies. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *39*, 426–443
- Lian, T., Tunku, U., & Rahman, A. (2018). *The Implications of the Paris Climate Agreement for Malaysia*, (April).
- Malo, M., & Bédard, K. (2012). Basin-Scale Assessment for CO₂ Storage Prospectivity in the Province of Québec, Canada. *Energy Procedia*, *23*, 487–494.
- Mansour, E. M., Al-Sabagh, A. M., Desouky, S. M., Zawawy, F. M., & Ramzi, M. (2017). A New Estimating Method of Minimum Miscibility Pressure as a Key Parameter in Designing CO₂ Gas Injection Process. *Egyptian Journal of Petroleum*.
- Mastali, M., Abdollahnejad, Z., & Pacheco-Torgal, F. (2018). Carbon Dioxide Sequestration of Fly Ash Alkaline-Based Mortars Containing Recycled Aggregates and Reinforced by Hemp Fibres.
- Paper, C., Junin, R., Teknologi, U., Zulaika, D., Hasbollah, A., Teknologi, U., Junin, R. (2016). Evaluation Of Potential Sedimentary Basins In Malaysia For Carbon Dioxide Storage

WEENTECH Proceedings in Energy 16th - 18th August 2016 Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh United Kingdom Volume 3: International Conference on Energy, (August).

Peck, W. A., Glazewski, K. A., Klenner, R. C. L., Gorecki, C. D., Steadman, E. N., & Harju, J. A. (2014). ScienceDirect: A Workflow to Determine CO₂ Storage Potential in Deep Saline Formations. *Energy Procedia*, 63, 5231–5238.

Person, M., Banerjee, A., Rupp, J., Medina, C., Lichtner, P., Gable, C., Bense, V. (2010). Assessment of Basin-Scale Hydrologic Impacts of CO₂ Sequestration, Illinois Basin. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 4(5), 840–854.

Petersen, H. I., Sherwood, N., Mathiesen, A., Fyhn, M. B. W., Dau, N. T., Russell, N., Nielsen, L. H. (2009). Application of Integrated Vitrinite Reflectance and FAMM Analyses for Thermal Maturity Assessment of the Northeastern Malay Basin, Offshore Vietnam: Implications for Petroleum Prospectivity Evaluation. *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, 26(3), 319–332.

Pollyea, R. M., & Rimstidt, J. D. (2017). Rate Equations for Modeling Carbon Dioxide Sequestration in Basalt. *Applied Geochemistry*, 81, 53–62.

Raza, A., Gholami, R., Rezaee, R., Han Bing, C., Nagarajan, R., & Ali Hamid, M. (2017). Preliminary Assessments of CO₂ Storage in Carbonate Formations: A Case Study from

Malaysia. *Journal of Geophysics and Engineering*, 14(3), 533–554.

Rossen, W. R., van Duijn, C. J., Nguyen, Q. P., Shen, C., & Vikingstad, A. K. (2010). Injection Strategies To Overcome Gravity Segregation in Simultaneous Gas and Water Injection Into Homogeneous Reservoirs. *SPE Journal*, 15(01), 76–90.

Stauffer, P. H., Viswanathan, H. S., Pawar, R. J., & Guthrie, G. D. (2009). A System Model for Geologic Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 43(3), 565–570.

Teletzke, G. F., & Lu, P. (2013). Guidelines for Reservoir Modeling of Geologic CO₂ Storage. *Energy Procedia*, 37, 3936–3944.

USDOE (U.S. Department of Energy), (2012) *Carbon Sequestration Atlas of the United States and Canada, 4th Ed.*

Willuweit, M., Azmi, M. B. K., Silalahi, E., Management, E. P., & Petrofac, S. F. (2015). Application of Big Loop Uncertainty Analysis to Assist History Matching and Optimize Development of a Waterflood Field. *Society of Petroleum Engineers*,

Yun Shing, C. (1992). Petrographic and Diagenetic Studies of the Reservoir Sandstone of the Malay Basin. *Geol. Soc. Malaysia, Bulletin*, 32, 261–283. .