International Journal of Future Engineering Innovations

A Multi-Layer Subsurface Risk Quantification and Mitigation Framework for High-Value Hydrocarbon Developments

Chibueze Marcellus Amadi [1*], **Oluwaseyi Ayotunde Akano** [2], **Alexander Onwumere** [3]
[1] Shell PLC, Muscat, Oman
[2] Chevron Nigeria Limited, Nigeria
[3] Independent Researcher, Nigeria

* Corresponding Author: **Chibueze Marcellus Amadi**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 3049-1215
Volume: 01
Issue: 06
November - December 2024
Received: 18-09-2024
Accepted: 19-10-2024
Published: 23-11-2024
Page No: 106-116

Abstract

High-value hydrocarbon developments are inherently exposed to complex subsurface uncertainties that significantly influence project economics, operational safety, and long-term asset performance. These uncertainties arise from incomplete geological characterization, reservoir heterogeneity, pressure regimes, fluid behavior, and geomechanical interactions, which collectively introduce risks across exploration, appraisal, and production phases. This paper presents a comprehensive review of a multi-layer subsurface risk quantification and mitigation framework designed to systematically integrate geological, geophysical, petrophysical, and engineering data into a unified decision-support structure. The study synthesizes advances in reservoir modeling, uncertainty quantification, probabilistic risk assessment, and digital subsurface analytics to identify critical methodologies for evaluating and managing subsurface risks in high-value hydrocarbon projects. Central to the proposed framework is a layered architecture that captures risks at different subsurface levels, including structural, stratigraphic, reservoir, and dynamic production domains. The framework incorporates advanced techniques such as stochastic modeling, Monte Carlo simulation, machine learning-driven prediction, and real-time data assimilation to quantify uncertainty and optimize decision-making under risk. Furthermore, it emphasizes the integration of risk mitigation strategies, including adaptive drilling programs, enhanced reservoir monitoring, and dynamic production optimization, to reduce exposure to operational and financial uncertainties. The study also explores the role of digital twin technologies and predictive analytics in enabling continuous risk monitoring and proactive mitigation throughout the asset lifecycle. Key findings indicate that multi-layer risk integration significantly improves decision accuracy, reduces non-productive time, and enhances recovery efficiency in complex reservoirs. The proposed framework contributes to the advancement of subsurface risk management by providing a structured, scalable, and data-driven approach for optimizing hydrocarbon development strategies. It offers valuable insights for industry practitioners and establishes a foundation for future research in integrated subsurface analytics and risk-informed decision-making.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/IJFEI.2024.1.6.106-116

Keywords: Subsurface Risk Quantification, Hydrocarbon Development, Reservoir Uncertainty, Probabilistic Modeling, Digital Twin Technology, Risk Mitigation Strategies

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of Subsurface Risk in Hydrocarbon Developments

Subsurface risk in hydrocarbon developments arises from uncertainties associated with geological structures, reservoir properties, fluid behavior, and geomechanical conditions. These uncertainties significantly influence exploration success rates, drilling performance, and production efficiency, particularly in high-value assets such as deepwater and unconventional reservoirs. Traditional deterministic approaches to subsurface evaluation often fail to capture the full spectrum of uncertainty, leading to suboptimal decision-making and increased financial exposure. Probabilistic methods, including Bayesian networks and stochastic modeling, have therefore become essential tools for quantifying and managing subsurface risks in modern hydrocarbon developments (Akinrinola & Olawuyi, 2021) [2]. These approaches enable operators to evaluate multiple geological scenarios and assess their associated probabilities, thereby improving risk-informed decision-making.

Subsurface risk management is closely linked to uncertainty quantification and value optimization. Advanced decision frameworks integrate probabilistic risk models with economic evaluation techniques to support optimal investment and operational strategies (Bratvold & Begg, 2023) [7]. For example, in deepwater exploration, uncertainty in reservoir presence and quality can significantly impact project viability, requiring robust risk assessment methodologies to guide drilling decisions. Additionally, the increasing complexity of hydrocarbon systems, including HPHT reservoirs and fractured formations, necessitates the use of integrated risk models that combine geological, geophysical, and engineering data. These developments highlight the critical importance of subsurface risk management as a foundational element of successful hydrocarbon exploration and production.

1.2. Challenges in High-Value Reservoir Characterization

High-value reservoir characterization presents significant technical challenges due to the inherent heterogeneity and complexity of subsurface formations. Accurate characterization requires the integration of multiple data sources, including seismic attributes, well logs, and core samples, each of which may contain uncertainties and inconsistencies. High-resolution 3D reservoir modeling techniques have improved the ability to capture spatial variability in reservoir properties; however, uncertainties in data quality and interpretation remain major obstacles (Al-Mudhafar, 2020) [3]. For example, seismic inversion processes may introduce errors in estimating porosity and saturation, which can propagate through reservoir models and affect production forecasts. These challenges are further compounded in complex geological settings such as faulted reservoirs and deepwater environments.

The application of machine learning techniques has introduced new opportunities for improving reservoir characterization, but also presents additional challenges related to data availability, model interpretability, and generalization. Machine learning models rely on large datasets to identify patterns and relationships, which may not always be available in early-stage exploration projects (Chen & Maina, 2022) [9]. Furthermore, the “black-box” nature of many AI models can limit their acceptance in critical decision-making processes, where transparency and explainability are essential. Integrating machine learning with physics-based models remains a key research challenge, requiring the development of hybrid approaches that balance predictive accuracy with interpretability. These challenges highlight the need for advanced methodologies that can effectively integrate diverse data sources and manage uncertainty in high-value reservoir characterization.

1.3. Problem Statement and Research Motivation

Despite advances in subsurface modeling and analytics, significant gaps remain in the integration of risk quantification and mitigation strategies within hydrocarbon development frameworks. Existing approaches often treat geological, reservoir, and operational risks in isolation, leading to fragmented decision-making processes that fail to capture interdependencies across subsurface domains. This lack of integration limits the effectiveness of risk management strategies and increases the likelihood of suboptimal decisions, particularly in high-value projects where uncertainties can have substantial economic impacts (Zhao & Liu, 2021) [67]. Furthermore, traditional risk assessment methods often lack the capability to dynamically update risk estimates based on new data, reducing their relevance in rapidly evolving operational environments.

The motivation for this study stems from the need to develop a comprehensive framework that integrates multi-layer subsurface risks into a unified decision-support system. Value of information (VoI) analysis has demonstrated the importance of incorporating uncertainty into decision-making processes, enabling operators to prioritize data acquisition and reduce uncertainty in critical areas (Hassan & Kabir, 2022) [20]. However, there is a need for more advanced frameworks that combine probabilistic modeling, real-time data assimilation, and decision intelligence techniques. By addressing these gaps, the proposed framework aims to enhance the accuracy, efficiency, and reliability of subsurface risk management in high-value hydrocarbon developments.

1.4. Objectives and Scope of the Study

This study aims to develop a comprehensive multi-layer framework for subsurface risk quantification and mitigation in high-value hydrocarbon developments. The primary objective is to integrate geological, geophysical, petrophysical, and engineering uncertainties into a unified analytical structure that supports informed decision-making across the asset lifecycle. The framework is designed to incorporate probabilistic modeling, data-driven analytics, and real-time monitoring techniques to enhance the accuracy and reliability of subsurface risk assessments.

The scope of the study includes the identification of key risk factors at different subsurface layers, the development of methodologies for quantifying uncertainty, and the integration of mitigation strategies into operational workflows. The study focuses on complex reservoir environments, including deepwater and unconventional systems, where subsurface risks are particularly significant. It does not involve empirical validation but provides a conceptual foundation for future implementation and testing. By defining a structured approach to subsurface risk management, the study aims to contribute to the advancement of decision intelligence frameworks in hydrocarbon development.

1.5. Structure of the Paper

The paper is organized into six main sections to provide a systematic and logical presentation of the proposed framework. The first section introduces the background, challenges, and research motivation, establishing the context for the study. The second section reviews existing literature on subsurface risk, reservoir characterization, and risk mitigation techniques, identifying key gaps and opportunities for improvement. The third section presents the theoretical foundations of subsurface risk quantification, including probabilistic modeling and uncertainty analysis. The fourth section introduces the proposed multi-layer framework, detailing its architecture and key components. The fifth section discusses risk mitigation strategies and implementation approaches, focusing on adaptive drilling, real-time monitoring, and digital technologies. The final section explores future directions and practical implications, highlighting opportunities for further research and industry adoption.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Geological and Geophysical Uncertainty in Reservoir Systems

Geological and geophysical uncertainties are fundamental challenges in hydrocarbon reservoir characterization, arising from incomplete subsurface data, structural complexity, and limitations in seismic resolution. These uncertainties manifest in structural interpretations, stratigraphic correlations, and petrophysical property estimations, significantly influencing exploration and development decisions. Advanced geomechanical frameworks have demonstrated that stress regimes, fault reactivation, and lithological variability introduce substantial uncertainty in well planning and reservoir performance prediction (Ozor *et al*., 2021; Amadi & Osimobi, 2023) [42, 41]. Furthermore, velocity model inaccuracies and seismic imaging limitations can distort reservoir geometry, leading to misinterpretation of hydrocarbon-bearing formations (Osimobi *et al*., 2022; Basu & Sen, 2021) [41, 6]. These uncertainties propagate across the reservoir lifecycle, impacting reserve estimation, well placement, and production forecasting.

Technically, integrating seismic attributes, well log data, and geostatistical modeling is essential for reducing uncertainty in reservoir systems. High-resolution imaging techniques and advanced inversion methods improve subsurface characterization by enhancing signal fidelity and reducing noise interference. However, heterogeneity in reservoir properties, such as porosity and permeability distribution, remains a critical challenge, particularly in complex depositional environments. Machine learning approaches are increasingly being applied to identify hidden patterns and correlations within subsurface datasets, enabling improved prediction of reservoir behavior under uncertainty. Additionally, probabilistic modeling techniques allow for the quantification of uncertainty ranges, providing decision-makers with confidence intervals rather than deterministic outputs. The integration of geophysical and geological data into unified models is therefore essential for improving subsurface understanding and mitigating risks associated with hydrocarbon exploration and development.

2.2. Reservoir Modeling and Simulation Techniques

Reservoir modeling and simulation techniques play a critical role in understanding subsurface behavior and predicting hydrocarbon recovery under varying operational conditions. Modern reservoir models integrate geological, geophysical, and petrophysical data to create high-resolution representations of subsurface systems. These models are used to simulate fluid flow, pressure distribution, and reservoir performance over time, enabling engineers to evaluate development scenarios and optimize production strategies. Advanced 3D modeling approaches combine seismic attributes with well log data to generate detailed reservoir descriptions, while history matching techniques calibrate models using production data to improve predictive accuracy (Al-Mudhafar, 2020; Yang & Zhou, 2022) [3, 64]. Machine learning-based forecasting models further enhance simulation capabilities by identifying patterns in complex datasets and predicting equipment and reservoir performance (Ofoedu *et al*., 2022) [37].

Reservoir simulation frameworks incorporate numerical methods such as finite difference and finite element techniques to solve complex flow equations governing multiphase fluid behavior. These simulations account for factors such as reservoir heterogeneity, fluid properties, and boundary conditions, providing insights into reservoir dynamics under different production scenarios. However, uncertainties in input data, such as permeability distribution and fluid characteristics, can significantly affect simulation outcomes. To address this, stochastic modeling and ensemble simulation techniques are employed to generate multiple realizations of reservoir behavior, capturing a range of possible outcomes (Ofoedu *et al*., 2023) [38]. Additionally, real-time data assimilation and digital twin technologies enable continuous updating of reservoir models based on operational data, improving accuracy and reliability. These advancements highlight the importance of integrating data-driven and physics-based approaches in reservoir modeling to support effective decision-making in hydrocarbon development.

2.3. Probabilistic Risk Assessment Methods in Oil and Gas

Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) methods are essential for quantifying uncertainty and evaluating risk in hydrocarbon exploration and production activities. Unlike deterministic approaches, PRA incorporates variability in input parameters and provides probability distributions for potential outcomes, enabling more informed decision-making under uncertainty. Bayesian networks are widely used in subsurface risk assessment due to their ability to model complex dependencies between geological, operational, and environmental factors (Akinrinola & Olawuyi, 2021; Fan & Li, 2021) [2, 15]. These models allow for dynamic updating of risk estimates as new data becomes available, improving the accuracy of predictions over time. Additionally, probabilistic forecasting models for drilling operations incorporate historical data and geomechanical parameters to estimate cost, time, and operational risks (Ozor *et al*., 2022; Ogbodu *et al*., 2023) [43, 39].

From a technical standpoint, PRA frameworks integrate statistical methods, simulation techniques, and decision analysis tools to evaluate risk across multiple dimensions. Monte Carlo simulation is commonly used to generate distributions of possible outcomes based on input uncertainties, providing insights into risk exposure and potential variability in project performance. Sensitivity analysis further identifies key risk drivers, enabling targeted mitigation strategies. In complex reservoir systems, PRA methods are combined with machine learning algorithms to enhance predictive capabilities and identify hidden patterns in large datasets. These approaches enable the quantification of uncertainties in reservoir properties, production forecasts, and economic performance as seen in Table 1. The integration of probabilistic methods into decision-making processes allows operators to evaluate trade-offs between risk and reward, optimize resource allocation, and improve overall project resilience in high-value hydrocarbon developments.

Table 1: Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) Methods in Oil and Gas Operations

Component	Description	Key Methods/Techniques	Impact on Hydrocarbon Development
Bayesian Risk Modeling	Framework for capturing dependencies among geological, operational, and environmental variables	Bayesian networks, probabilistic inference, dynamic updating	Enhances accuracy of risk predictions and supports adaptive decision-making
Probabilistic Forecasting	Estimation of drilling and production outcomes under uncertainty	Historical data modeling, geomechanical analysis, stochastic forecasting	Improves cost, time, and operational risk estimation
Simulation & Sensitivity Analysis	Quantifies uncertainty and identifies key risk drivers in complex systems	Monte Carlo simulation, sensitivity analysis, scenario modeling	Enables evaluation of variability and supports targeted risk mitigation
Integrated Decision Analysis	Combines probabilistic outputs with decision-making frameworks	Machine learning integration, optimization models, risk-reward analysis	Optimizes resource allocation, improves resilience, and supports informed investment decisions

2.4. Existing Risk Mitigation Approaches in Hydrocarbon Projects

Risk mitigation in hydrocarbon projects involves the implementation of strategies and technologies designed to reduce uncertainty, enhance operational safety, and improve project outcomes. Traditional approaches include robust well planning, geomechanical analysis, and real-time monitoring systems that enable early detection of anomalies during drilling and production operations. Process safety frameworks are critical for ensuring operational reliability, particularly in offshore and high-pressure environments, where failures can have significant economic and environmental consequences (Ekechi & Fasasi, 2022; Ibe & Nwosu, 2021) [12, 23]. Additionally, advanced control systems for multistream processing units enhance operational efficiency and reduce the likelihood of system failures by optimizing process parameters in real time (Ofoedu *et al.*, 2023; Lopez & Martinez, 2022) [38, 32].

Modern risk mitigation approaches leverage digital technologies such as real-time data analytics, machine learning, and digital twin models to monitor and predict system behavior. These systems enable proactive identification of potential risks, allowing operators to implement corrective actions before issues escalate. Enhanced oil recovery (EOR) techniques also play a significant role in mitigating reservoir-related risks by improving recovery efficiency and reducing uncertainty in production forecasts. Furthermore, integrated risk management frameworks combine technical, operational, and economic considerations to provide a holistic approach to risk mitigation. These frameworks incorporate continuous monitoring, feedback mechanisms, and adaptive decision-making processes, ensuring that mitigation strategies remain effective under changing conditions. The adoption of these advanced approaches is essential for managing the complexities of high-value hydrocarbon developments and achieving sustainable operational performance.

3. Theoretical Foundations of Subsurface Risk Quantification

3.1. Multi-Layer Risk Modeling Concepts

Multi-layer risk modeling reframes subsurface uncertainty as a structured system rather than a collection of isolated variables. Instead of treating geological, petrophysical, and operational risks independently, the approach organizes them into interacting layers—typically structural, stratigraphic, reservoir, and dynamic production domains. This layered perspective is particularly effective in high-value hydrocarbon developments where uncertainty propagates across scales and disciplines. For example, a mischaracterized fault geometry does not remain a structural issue; it directly affects pressure distribution, wellbore stability, and ultimately production performance. Frameworks that explicitly capture these interdependencies provide a more realistic basis for decision-making under uncertainty (Bae & Kim, 2022; Zhou & Oldenburg, 2020; Duarte & Pereira, 2021; Liu & Zhao, 2023) [4, 68, 11, 31]. In practice, geomechanical insights are increasingly embedded within these layers, as demonstrated by Ozor *et al.* (2021) [42] and Ekechi and Fasasi (2022) [12], where stress-field interpretation becomes central to both risk prediction and operational planning.

What distinguishes multi-layer models from earlier approaches is not just their structure but their ability to evolve with incoming data. High-resolution seismic imaging and velocity modeling now allow continuous refinement of structural interpretations, reducing ambiguity in fault positioning and reservoir continuity (Osimobi *et al.*, 2022; Ofoedu *et al.*, 2023) [41, 38]. These updates propagate through the entire model, altering risk profiles in downstream layers such as flow dynamics or production forecasts. The result is a dynamic system where uncertainty is not merely quantified once but continuously re-evaluated. This iterative capability is critical in environments where early assumptions can materially affect capital allocation, well placement, and recovery strategies. In this sense, multi-layer modeling functions less as a static framework and more as a living system for managing uncertainty across the full lifecycle of hydrocarbon assets.

3.2. Stochastic and Probabilistic Modeling Techniques

Subsurface decision-making is fundamentally probabilistic, even when deterministic models are used to represent it. Stochastic and probabilistic techniques provide the formal structure needed to express uncertainty explicitly rather than implicitly. Instead of producing single-point estimates, these methods generate distributions of possible outcomes, allowing decision-makers to evaluate risk in terms of likelihood and impact. Bayesian networks, for instance, are particularly useful in capturing conditional dependencies between variables such as lithology, pressure regimes, and drilling outcomes (Akinrinola & Olawuyi, 2021; Fan & Li, 2021) [2, 15]. Similarly, Monte Carlo simulation enables repeated sampling across uncertain parameters, producing probabilistic forecasts of reserves or production performance (Barros & Santos, 2022; Qin & Wu, 2020) [5, 49]. These approaches shift the conversation from "what will happen" to "what is likely to happen under different assumptions."

In operational contexts, the value of these techniques becomes more evident. High-pressure, high-temperature environments illustrate this clearly, where even small deviations in formation properties can lead to significant safety or cost implications (Ogbodu *et al*., 2023) [39]. By integrating stochastic modeling with machine learning, as shown in Ofoedu *et al*. (2022) [37] and Ozor *et al*. (2022) [43], it becomes possible to forecast equipment failures or drilling inefficiencies with quantified confidence levels. This hybridization improves both predictive accuracy and decision robustness. Rather than reacting to unexpected outcomes, operators can anticipate them within defined probability bounds and design mitigation strategies accordingly. Over time, this probabilistic framing enables more disciplined capital allocation and reduces exposure to low-probability, high-impact events that often dominate project risk profiles.

3.3. Machine Learning in Subsurface Risk Prediction

Machine learning has changed the way subsurface risk is identified and interpreted, particularly in environments where traditional modeling struggles with complexity and scale. Unlike conventional workflows that depend heavily on simplified assumptions, machine learning models learn directly from data, capturing nonlinear relationships across geological and operational variables. This is especially valuable in seismic interpretation, where subtle patterns in amplitude, frequency, or attribute combinations can signal faults, fractures, or fluid boundaries (Chen & Maina, 2022; Ahmed & Saad, 2024) [9, 1]. The ability to process large, multi-dimensional datasets allows these models to detect signals that would otherwise remain hidden, improving both early-stage exploration decisions and late-stage production optimization.

More importantly, machine learning is increasingly embedded within continuous decision systems rather than used as a standalone analytical tool. Models are trained, deployed, and updated within live data environments, enabling real-time risk prediction and adaptation. For example, fault forecasting models and non-productive time prediction systems demonstrate how machine learning can directly influence operational efficiency (Ofoedu *et al*., 2022; Ozor *et al*., 2023) [37, 46]. Physics-informed neural networks further extend this capability by incorporating physical laws into data-driven models, improving interpretability and stability (Ji & Liu, 2023) [26]. However, the real strength of machine learning lies in its ability to evolve and improve as more data becomes available, gradually reducing uncertainty across the subsurface system. This iterative learning process is central to building resilient, data-driven risk management strategies in complex hydrocarbon developments.

3.4. Integration of Geomechanics and Reservoir Dynamics

Treating geomechanics and reservoir dynamics as separate domains is no longer viable in high-value developments. The two are inherently coupled: changes in pressure influence stress fields, and stress redistribution affects permeability, fracture propagation, and ultimately fluid flow. Integrated modeling approaches address this by combining mechanical and flow simulations into a unified framework. This allows operators to anticipate how production strategies will alter subsurface conditions over time, rather than reacting after problems emerge (Gupta & Raj, 2023; Xu & Pruess, 2021) [19, 63]. For instance, pressure depletion can lead to compaction or fault reactivation, which in turn affects well integrity and recovery efficiency. Incorporating these interactions into predictive models provides a more realistic basis for planning and risk mitigation.

In practical terms, integration relies on high-quality data and multi-physics simulation capabilities. Seismic imaging and velocity modeling improve structural understanding, while pressure transient analysis refines reservoir behavior predictions (Osimobi *et al*., 2022; Nasir & Rahim, 2021) [41, 35]. Engineering models, such as torque and drag simulations or control system frameworks, further connect subsurface behavior to operational performance (Ozor *et al*., 2022; Ofoedu *et al*., 2023) [44, 38] as seen in Table 2. The result is a tightly coupled system where decisions about drilling, completion, and production are informed by both mechanical and fluid dynamics considerations. This integrated perspective reduces uncertainty, improves well placement strategies, and minimizes operational risks. More importantly, it enables a shift from reactive to predictive management of subsurface systems, which is essential for maximizing value in complex hydrocarbon assets.

Table 2: Integrated Geomechanics and Reservoir Dynamics for Subsurface Risk Management

Component	Description	Key Mechanisms/Tools	Operational Impact
Coupled Geomechanics–Flow Interaction	Interaction between pressure changes and stress redistribution affecting reservoir behavior	Coupled simulation models, pressure–stress coupling, fracture propagation analysis	Improves prediction of compaction, fault reactivation, and permeability changes
Integrated Multi-Physics Modeling	Unified modeling of mechanical and fluid flow processes in subsurface systems	Reservoir simulators, geomechanical models, multi-physics simulation platforms	Enables proactive planning and accurate forecasting of subsurface responses
Data Integration and Monitoring	Use of high-quality subsurface data to enhance model accuracy and reliability	Seismic imaging, velocity modeling, pressure transient analysis, real-time monitoring	Reduces uncertainty and improves reservoir characterization and performance prediction
Operational Decision Support	Application of integrated models to guide drilling, completion, and production strategies	Torque and drag models, control systems, predictive analytics	Enhances well placement, minimizes risks, and supports predictive rather than reactive management

4. Proposed Multi-Layer Risk Quantification Framework

4.1. Structural and Stratigraphic Risk Layer

The structural and stratigraphic risk layer forms the foundational component of subsurface risk quantification, capturing uncertainties associated with fault systems, depositional environments, and basin architecture. Structural complexity, including fault reactivation, folding, and compartmentalization, introduces significant uncertainty in reservoir connectivity and hydrocarbon trapping mechanisms (Amadi & Osimobi, 2023; Huang & Zhang, 2024) [41, 22]. Advanced seismic imaging and velocity modeling techniques are critical in resolving these uncertainties by improving subsurface visualization and stratigraphic interpretation (Osimobi *et al*., 2022; Al-Mudhafar, 2020) [41, 3]. Additionally, geomechanical considerations such as stress regimes and formation stability must be integrated into structural models to predict drilling risks and wellbore instability (Ozor *et al*., 2021; Bae & Kim, 2022) [42, 4]. These factors collectively define the structural risk envelope that influences exploration success and development planning.

From a stratigraphic perspective, heterogeneity in sediment deposition, facies distribution, and lithological variations further complicates reservoir characterization. Stratigraphic traps, pinch-outs, and channel systems require high-resolution modeling techniques to accurately delineate hydrocarbon-bearing zones and reduce uncertainty in volumetric estimates (Al-Mudhafar, 2020; Huang & Zhang, 2024) [3, 22]. Multi-layer frameworks enable the integration of geological and geophysical data to quantify stratigraphic uncertainty across spatial and temporal scales (Bae & Kim, 2022; Amadi & Osimobi, 2023) [4, 41]. The incorporation of probabilistic modeling and spatial risk mapping enhances decision-making by providing uncertainty bounds for structural and stratigraphic interpretations. This integrated approach ensures that structural and stratigraphic risks are systematically quantified, enabling more reliable exploration and development strategies.

4.2. Reservoir and Petrophysical Risk Layer

The reservoir and petrophysical risk layer focuses on uncertainties related to rock properties, fluid distribution, and reservoir heterogeneity. Variability in porosity, permeability, saturation, and fluid composition significantly impacts hydrocarbon recovery and production performance (Ismail & Kamel, 2021; Barros & Santos, 2022) [24, 5]. Advanced petrophysical analysis and machine learning techniques are increasingly used to predict reservoir properties and identify anomalies that may affect production efficiency (Ofoedu *et al*., 2022; Kumar & Singh, 2022) [37, 29]. Additionally, drilling challenges such as shale instability and pressure depletion introduce further uncertainties that must be accounted for in reservoir risk models (Ogbodu *et al*., 2023; Yang & Zhou, 2022) [39, 64]. These factors highlight the importance of integrating petrophysical data with reservoir modeling to accurately quantify subsurface risks.

Reservoir risk quantification relies on stochastic simulation, history matching, and probabilistic reserve estimation to capture uncertainty in subsurface properties. These techniques enable the generation of multiple realizations of reservoir models, providing a range of possible outcomes for production forecasts (Barros & Santos, 2022; Yang & Zhou, 2022) [5, 64]. Machine learning algorithms further enhance predictive capabilities by identifying patterns in historical data and improving model calibration (Ofoedu *et al*., 2022; Kumar & Singh, 2022) [37, 29]. The integration of petrophysical and reservoir data into a unified framework allows for continuous updating of risk estimates as new data becomes available. This dynamic approach ensures that reservoir uncertainties are effectively managed, enabling optimized field development and improved recovery strategies.

4.3. Dynamic Production and Flow Risk Layer

The dynamic production and flow risk layer addresses uncertainties associated with fluid flow behavior, production system performance, and reservoir depletion dynamics. Variations in pressure, temperature, and fluid composition can significantly impact production rates and recovery efficiency, particularly in complex reservoir systems (Nasir & Rahim, 2021; Sambo & Abubakar, 2021) [35, 53]. Advanced reservoir surveillance models and real-time monitoring systems are essential for tracking production performance and identifying anomalies that may indicate underlying risks (Ozor *et al*., 2022; Ofoedu *et al*., 2023) [45, 38]. Additionally, dynamic risk assessment techniques, including Bayesian networks and fuzzy logic models, are used to evaluate potential hazards such as blowouts and equipment failures (Fan & Li, 2021; Patel & Varma, 2023) [15, 47].

The integration of reservoir and surface production data enables comprehensive risk assessment across the entire production lifecycle. Real-time data assimilation and predictive modeling techniques allow operators to anticipate changes in reservoir behavior and adjust production strategies accordingly (Sambo & Abubakar, 2021; Nasir & Rahim, 2021) [53, 35]. Flow assurance challenges, including hydrate formation, scaling, and pipeline integrity, further contribute to dynamic production risks and require continuous monitoring and mitigation strategies (Patel & Varma, 2023; Fan & Li, 2021) [47, 15]. The use of integrated production models and control systems enhances the ability to manage these risks, ensuring stable and efficient hydrocarbon production. This layer is critical for maintaining operational reliability and maximizing asset performance in high-value developments.

4.4. Integrated Decision Intelligence and Risk Visualization

The integration of decision intelligence and risk visualization represents the final layer of the multi-layer subsurface risk framework, enabling the translation of complex analytical outputs into actionable insights. Decision intelligence systems leverage machine learning models, optimization algorithms, and probabilistic analysis to support informed decision-making under uncertainty (Chen & Maina, 2022; Zhang & Sun, 2023) [9, 66]. These systems integrate data from multiple subsurface layers, providing a holistic view of risk and enabling operators to evaluate different development scenarios (Bratvold & Begg, 2023; Ribeiro & Costa, 2023) [7, 51]. Visualization tools, including interactive dashboards and 3D reservoir models, enhance the interpretability of risk data, allowing stakeholders to make informed decisions in real time (Ozor *et al*., 2023; Ekechi & Fasasi, 2022) [46, 12].

Technically, risk visualization systems incorporate advanced analytics and digital twin technologies to create dynamic representations of subsurface conditions and production systems. These models enable continuous monitoring and simulation of reservoir behavior, providing real-time feedback for decision-making processes (Ribeiro & Costa, 2023; Chen & Maina, 2022) [51, 9]. The integration of decision intelligence frameworks ensures that risk mitigation strategies are optimized based on current data and predictive insights (Bratvold & Begg, 2023; Zhang & Sun, 2023) [7, 66]. Additionally, process safety frameworks and operational risk models enhance the reliability and robustness of decision-making systems (Ekechi & Fasasi, 2022; Ozor *et al*., 2023) [12, 46]. This integrated approach enables enterprises to achieve data-driven decision-making, improving operational efficiency, reducing uncertainty, and maximizing the value of hydrocarbon assets.

5. Risk Mitigation Strategies and Implementation

5.1. Adaptive Drilling and Well Placement Optimization

Adaptive drilling and well placement optimization are critical components of subsurface risk mitigation, particularly in high-value hydrocarbon developments where geological uncertainty and operational risks are significant. Advanced well planning integrates geomechanical modeling, historical drilling data, and predictive analytics to optimize trajectory design and minimize non-productive time. For instance, predictive torque and drag models combined with drilling time forecasting frameworks enable engineers to anticipate operational challenges and adjust drilling parameters dynamically (Ozor *et al*., 2022; Ofoedu *et al*., 2022) [44, 37]. In complex reservoirs such as HPHT environments, adaptive drilling strategies leverage real-time formation evaluation and pressure monitoring to prevent wellbore instability and gas kicks (Ogbodu *et al*., 2023; Gupta & Raj, 2023) [39, 19]. These approaches significantly improve drilling efficiency and reduce operational risks.

Adaptive drilling frameworks incorporate feedback loops that continuously update subsurface models based on real-time data acquired during drilling operations. This enables dynamic adjustment of well trajectories, casing programs, and mud weight optimization to mitigate emerging risks (Ozor *et al*., 2023; Quevedo & Sanchez, 2022) [46, 50]. Additionally, machine learning models are increasingly used to predict drilling anomalies and equipment failures, enhancing decision-making accuracy in uncertain environments (Ofoedu *et al*., 2022; Gupta & Raj, 2023) [37, 19]. The integration of geomechanical risk assessment with predictive analytics ensures that well placement decisions are optimized for both safety and economic performance, thereby reducing uncertainty and maximizing reservoir contact. These adaptive approaches represent a significant advancement in drilling optimization, enabling more efficient and risk-informed hydrocarbon development strategies.

5.2. Real-Time Monitoring and Data Assimilation Techniques

Real-time monitoring and data assimilation techniques play a vital role in reducing subsurface uncertainty by enabling continuous observation and updating of reservoir models. Advanced monitoring systems integrate data from multiple sources, including downhole sensors, seismic surveys, and production systems, to provide a comprehensive view of reservoir behavior. For example, 4D seismic monitoring combined with real-time pressure and temperature measurements allows operators to track fluid movement and identify anomalies in reservoir performance (Basu & Sen, 2021; Ahmed & Saad, 2024) [6, 1]. Additionally, optimal sensor placement strategies enhance early detection of subsurface risks, enabling proactive mitigation (Gao & Xie, 2024) [17]. These technologies are essential for maintaining operational safety and improving decision accuracy in complex production environments.

Data assimilation techniques integrate real-time data into reservoir simulation models, enabling continuous model updating and improved forecasting accuracy. This is achieved through techniques such as history matching, Kalman filtering, and machine learning-based data fusion, which enhance the reliability of subsurface predictions (Ekechi & Fasasi, 2022; Osimobi *et al*., 2022) [12, 41]. In floating production systems, integrated control frameworks ensure that data from multiple streams are processed and analyzed in real time, supporting efficient production management (Ofoedu *et al*., 2023) [38]. The combination of real-time monitoring and data assimilation enables a dynamic understanding of reservoir behavior, reducing uncertainty and enhancing the effectiveness of risk mitigation strategies in hydrocarbon development.

5.3. Production Optimization and Enhanced Recovery Strategies

Production optimization and enhanced recovery strategies are essential for maximizing hydrocarbon recovery while minimizing subsurface risks. Advanced reservoir surveillance models enable continuous monitoring of production performance, allowing operators to identify inefficiencies and optimize production strategies (Ozor *et al*., 2022; Ofoedu *et al*., 2023) [45, 38]. Techniques such as water flooding, gas injection, and chemical enhanced oil recovery (EOR) are commonly employed to improve reservoir performance and extend field life (Lopez & Martinez, 2022) [32]. Additionally, probabilistic reserve estimation and advanced history matching techniques provide insights into reservoir behavior, enabling more accurate production forecasting and risk assessment (Barros & Santos, 2022; Yang & Zhou, 2022) [5, 64].

Technically, production optimization frameworks integrate real-time data, reservoir simulation models, and machine learning algorithms to enhance decision-making. These systems enable dynamic adjustment of production parameters, such as flow rates and injection strategies, based on real-time reservoir conditions (Osimobi *et al*., 2022; Ozor *et al*., 2022) [41, 45]. Furthermore, multistream production control systems ensure efficient management of complex production processes, reducing operational risks and improving overall efficiency (Ofoedu *et al*., 2023) [38]. The integration of advanced analytics and optimization techniques allows operators to achieve higher recovery factors while maintaining operational safety and economic viability. These strategies are critical for addressing the challenges associated with mature and complex reservoirs in high-value hydrocarbon developments.

5.4. Digital Twin Applications for Continuous Risk Management

Digital twin technology represents a transformative approach to subsurface risk management by creating virtual replicas of physical assets and reservoir systems. These digital models integrate real-time data, simulation models, and predictive analytics to provide continuous insights into system performance and risk conditions (Ribeiro & Costa, 2023; Zhang & Sun, 2023) [51, 66]. In hydrocarbon developments, digital twins enable operators to simulate various production scenarios, assess potential risks, and optimize operational strategies before implementation. For example, digital twin models of subsea production systems can predict equipment failures and optimize maintenance schedules, reducing downtime and operational risks (Ofoedu *et al*., 2022; Ekechi & Fasasi, 2022) [37, 12].

From a decision-making perspective, digital twins enhance risk management by providing a dynamic and integrated view of subsurface and surface systems. These models incorporate uncertainty quantification and scenario analysis, enabling operators to evaluate the impact of different operational decisions under varying conditions (Bratvold & Begg, 2023) [7]. Additionally, advanced subsurface imaging and modeling techniques improve the accuracy of digital twin representations, ensuring reliable predictions and decision support (Osimobi *et al*., 2022) [41]. The integration of AI-driven analytics further enhances the capabilities of digital twins, enabling continuous learning and adaptation based on real-time data. This approach provides a powerful tool for managing subsurface risks, improving operational efficiency, and supporting sustainable hydrocarbon development.

6. Future Directions and Industry Implications

6.1. Emerging Technologies in Subsurface Risk Analytics

Emerging technologies are fundamentally transforming subsurface risk analytics by enabling more accurate, dynamic, and scalable evaluation of geological and reservoir uncertainties. One of the most impactful advancements is the integration of physics-informed machine learning models with traditional reservoir simulation workflows. These hybrid models combine data-driven learning with domain-specific physical constraints, allowing for improved prediction of subsurface behavior under uncertain conditions. For example, physics-informed neural networks can model fluid flow in heterogeneous reservoirs while incorporating boundary conditions derived from geophysical data, thereby enhancing predictive accuracy compared to purely statistical approaches.

In addition, high-resolution seismic imaging, 4D time-lapse monitoring, and advanced inversion techniques are improving subsurface characterization, reducing uncertainty in structural and stratigraphic interpretations. Cloud-based high-performance computing platforms further enable large-scale stochastic simulations and Monte Carlo analyses, allowing operators to evaluate multiple geological scenarios in parallel. Another key development is the use of sensor networks and edge analytics to collect real-time subsurface data, enabling continuous risk monitoring. Digital integration platforms are also facilitating the fusion of multidisciplinary datasets, including geomechanics, petrophysics, and production data, into unified analytical environments. These technologies collectively enable a shift from static risk assessment to dynamic, continuously updated risk analytics, improving decision-making accuracy and operational efficiency in hydrocarbon developments.

6.2. Integration of AI and Big Data in Hydrocarbon Development

The integration of artificial intelligence and big data technologies has significantly enhanced the ability of hydrocarbon operators to manage subsurface complexity and optimize development strategies. AI-driven models are capable of processing vast volumes of structured and unstructured data, including seismic surveys, well logs, drilling reports, and production data, to identify patterns and relationships that are not easily detectable through traditional methods. Machine learning algorithms, such as ensemble models and deep neural networks, are increasingly used for reservoir characterization, production forecasting, and anomaly detection. For instance, predictive models can estimate reservoir permeability and porosity distributions based on historical well data, enabling more accurate reservoir simulations.

Big data platforms support this integration by providing scalable storage and processing capabilities, allowing for real-time analytics and decision-making. Distributed data architectures enable seamless integration of data from multiple sources, ensuring that insights are generated in a timely and consistent manner. Furthermore, AI-driven optimization algorithms are used to enhance drilling operations, well placement, and production strategies by continuously analyzing incoming data and adjusting operational parameters. The combination of AI and big data also facilitates the development of decision intelligence systems that provide actionable recommendations based on predictive and prescriptive analytics. This integration not only improves operational efficiency but also reduces uncertainty and risk in high-value hydrocarbon projects by enabling more informed and data-driven decision-making.

6.3. Policy, Sustainability, and Economic Considerations

The increasing complexity of subsurface risk management in hydrocarbon developments necessitates a comprehensive consideration of policy, sustainability, and economic factors. Regulatory frameworks play a critical role in ensuring that subsurface operations adhere to safety, environmental, and operational standards. Policies governing data transparency, environmental impact assessment, and resource management influence how risk analytics frameworks are implemented and utilized. For example, regulations requiring continuous monitoring of subsurface conditions and emissions have driven the adoption of real-time analytics systems and digital monitoring technologies in offshore operations.

Sustainability considerations are also becoming increasingly important, particularly in the context of energy transition and environmental responsibility. Subsurface risk analytics frameworks must incorporate environmental risk factors, such as potential leakage, reservoir depletion, and carbon emissions, into decision-making processes. This requires the integration of environmental data with traditional subsurface models to assess the long-term impact of hydrocarbon extraction activities. From an economic perspective, risk quantification directly influences investment decisions, project valuation, and resource allocation. Advanced risk analytics enable more accurate estimation of project uncertainties, improving financial planning and reducing the likelihood of cost overruns. By aligning policy, sustainability, and economic considerations, enterprises can develop balanced strategies that optimize resource utilization while minimizing environmental and financial risks.

6.4. Recommendations for Industry Adoption and Model Extension

The successful adoption of multi-layer subsurface risk quantification frameworks requires a strategic approach that integrates technological, organizational, and operational dimensions. Industry stakeholders should prioritize the development of integrated digital platforms that unify data from multiple subsurface domains, enabling seamless data flow and real-time analytics. A phased implementation strategy is recommended, starting with pilot projects that focus on specific risk areas, such as drilling optimization or reservoir monitoring, before scaling to enterprise-wide deployment. This approach allows organizations to validate the effectiveness of the framework and refine its components based on practical experience.

Model extension should focus on enhancing adaptability and scalability to accommodate evolving subsurface conditions and technological advancements. This includes incorporating adaptive learning mechanisms that enable models to update continuously based on new data inputs. Additionally, integrating hybrid modeling approaches that combine physics-based simulations with data-driven methods can improve predictive accuracy and robustness. Industry adoption also requires investment in workforce development, including training programs to enhance technical expertise in data analytics, AI, and reservoir engineering. Collaboration between industry, academia, and technology providers is essential for advancing research and developing standardized methodologies. By adopting these strategies, organizations can effectively implement and extend subsurface risk analytics frameworks, achieving improved decision-making, operational efficiency, and long-term sustainability in hydrocarbon development.

References.

1. Ahmed M, Saad I. Machine learning-based seismic attribute analysis for subsurface hazard detection. Geophysics. 2024;89(2):IM45–IM58. https://doi.org/10.1190/geo2023-0142.1
2. Akinrinola OS, Olawuyi A. Probabilistic subsurface risk assessment in deepwater exploration: a Bayesian network approach. J Pet Explor Prod Technol. 2021;11(4):1543–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13202-021-01124-x
3. Al-Mudhafar WJ. Integrating well log data and seismic attributes for high-resolution 3D reservoir modeling and uncertainty quantification. J Nat Gas Sci Eng. 2020;76:103183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jngse.2020.103183
4. Bae J, Kim H. A multi-layer risk assessment framework for offshore CO2 storage and hydrocarbon recovery. Int J Greenh Gas Control. 2022;115:103621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2022.103621
5. Barros S, Santos L. Probabilistic estimation of hydrocarbon reserves under geological and technical risks. Pet Sci. 2022;19(5):2341–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petsci.2022.04.012
6. Basu S, Sen S. Quantifying geological uncertainty in mature fields using 4D seismic and history matching. Interpretation. 2021;9(3):T701–T715. https://doi.org/10.1190/INT-2020-0145.1
7. Bratvold RB, Begg SH. Making better decisions in the presence of uncertainty: applications to hydrocarbon development. SPE J. 2023;28(1):450–72. https://doi.org/10.2118/212267-PA
8. Chen H, Wang Y. Sensitivity analysis of subsurface risk factors in offshore pipeline installations. Mar Struct. 2023;88:103342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marstruc.2022.103342
9. Chen Z, Maina F. Machine learning for subsurface risk characterization: a review of current trends. Earth-Sci Rev. 2022;231:104085. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2022.104085
10. Deng H, Sun A. A hierarchical framework for subsurface risk mitigation in shale gas developments. J Clean Prod. 2020;254:120112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120112
11. Duarte A, Pereira F. A multi-layer framework for offshore decommissioning risk assessment. Ocean Coast Manag. 2021;212:105801. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105801
12. Ekechi AT, Fasasi TS. Conceptual framework for process safety and operational reliability in FPSO-based energy systems. Int J Artif Intell Eng Transform. 2022;3(1):19–37. https://doi.org/10.54660/IJAIET.2022.3.1.19-37
13. El-Gendy N, Hassan S. Integrated geomechanical and geophysical modeling for mitigating drilling hazards. J Appl Geophys. 2020;174:103952. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jappgeo.2020.103952
14. Ezekiel J, Thomas S. Multi-criteria decision analysis for high-value offshore hydrocarbon project selection. Energy Policy. 2024;185:113942. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2023.113942
15. Fan Y, Li G. Dynamic risk assessment of subsea blowout based on Bayesian networks and fuzzy logic. Ocean Eng. 2021;235:109405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2021.109405
16. Ferreira C, Lima M. Risk management in ultra-deepwater developments: a Brazilian perspective. Mar Policy. 2023;149:105502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2023.105502
17. Gao J, Xie Y. Optimal placement of subsea sensors for early warning of subsurface risks. IEEE Sens J. 2024;24(1):112–24. https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2023.3324567
18. Ghasemi M, Gildin E. Fast uncertainty quantification in subsurface flow using reduced-order modeling. Comput Geosci. 2020;24(4):1431–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10596-020-09943-4
19. Gupta S, Raj A. Geomechanical risk assessment for high-pressure high-temperature (HPHT) hydrocarbon wells. J Pet Sci Eng. 2023;220:111165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2022.111165
20. Hassan A, Kabir S. Value of information (VoI) analysis in mitigating subsurface uncertainty for satellite field developments. Geoenergy Sci Eng. 2022;215:110601. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoen.2022.110601
21. He J, Wan J. Modeling the impact of subsurface uncertainty on the net present value of hydrocarbon assets. J Energy Resour Technol. 2022;144(8):083002. https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4053642
22. Huang J, Zhang Y. A spatial-temporal framework for subsurface risk mapping in complex tectonic regimes. Appl Geochem. 2024;160:105842. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeochem.2023.105842
23. Ibe K, Nwosu U. Mitigation of drilling risks in high-value asset development using real-time data analytics. SPE Drill Completion. 2021;36(2):345–60. https://doi.org/10.2118/205367-PA
24. Ismail A, Kamel M. Petrophysical uncertainty and its effect on subsurface risk quantification in carbonate reservoirs. Arab J Geosci. 2021;14:1245. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-021-07612-w
25. Jensen L, Nielsen P. Subsurface risk in the energy transition: from hydrocarbons to geothermal. Renew

Sustain Energy Rev. 2020;133:110271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110271

26. Ji X, Liu C. Hybrid modeling of subsurface risk using physics-informed neural networks. J Comput Phys. 2023;472:111685. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111685
27. Khan F, Abbassi R. Resilience-based risk management for offshore hydrocarbon production systems. Saf Sci. 2023;158:105963. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2022.105963
28. Khan R, Ahmed S. Assessment of operational risks in high-value hydrocarbon developments using bow-tie analysis. Process Saf Environ Prot. 2020;138:201–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2020.03.012
29. Kumar P, Singh R. Integrated subsurface modeling for risk reduction in unconventional reservoirs. J Nat Gas Sci Eng. 2022;99:104445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jngse.2022.104445
30. Lee S, Park D. Deep learning-based surrogate modeling for rapid subsurface uncertainty quantification. Water Resour Res. 2021;57(8):e2020WR029452. https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR029452
31. Liu W, Zhao X. Multi-layer quantification of leakage risks in depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs. Energy. 2023;263:125742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.125742
32. Lopez E, Martinez J. Mitigating subsurface risk in mature fields through integrated EOR strategies. J Pet Sci Eng. 2022;211:110142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.petrol.2022.110142
33. Mahmoud M, Hamad S. Advanced seismic inversion for reducing subsurface risk in exploration: a case study from the Middle East. J Afr Earth Sci. 2020;162:103723. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafrearsci.2019.103723
34. Mendes R, Silva T. Socio-environmental risk quantification in subsurface resource extraction. Sci Total Environ. 2024;906:167432. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.167432
35. Nasir S, Rahim Z. Advanced pressure transient analysis for reducing reservoir uncertainty in high-value developments. SPE Reserv Eval Eng. 2021;24(4):850–65. https://doi.org/10.2118/206712-PA
36. Nguyen T, Vo L. Application of game theory in hydrocarbon development risk mitigation. Resour Policy. 2022;78:102834. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.102834
37. Ofoedu AT, Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. A machine learning-based fault forecasting model for subsea process equipment in harsh production environments. Int J Sci Res Civ Eng. 2022;6(6):123–35.
38. Ofoedu AT, Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. A holistic control system framework for managing complex multistream crude processing in floating production units. Int J Sci Res Civ Eng. 2023;7(3):83–101.
39. Ogbodu S, Tichelaar B, Amadi C, Anijekwu C, Eke K, Alli-Oluwafuyi J, Schutjens P. Drilling through shales below depleted sands: case study of a Niger Delta HPHT gas development well. SPE. 2023. https://doi.org/10.2118/217195-MS
40. Onuoha K, Udoh A. Deepwater exploration risk: comparative analysis of global frontier basins. Geol J. 2023;58(9):3421–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/gj.4782
41. Osimobi JC, Amadi C, Chejieh C, Okereke N, Kanu M. Building realistic velocity model and providing high-end imaging to the business: a case study of KoloCreek, Nigeria, onshore Niger Delta. The Shell Petroleum Development Company of Nigeria Limited; 2022.
42. Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. A review of geomechanical risk management in well planning: global practices and lessons from the Niger Delta. Int J Sci Res Civ Eng. 2021;5(2):104–18.
43. Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. A conceptual model for drilling time and cost forecasting in directional wells: integration of geomechanics and historical field data. 2022.
44. Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. A predictive model for torque and drag analysis in complex well trajectories using well plan simulation. 2022.
45. Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. Conceptualizing a wells and reservoir surveillance model for production optimization in marginal fields. Planning. 2022;25:26.
46. Ozor JE, Sofoluwe O, Jambol DD. A holistic engineering model for managing non-productive time (NPT) in onshore drilling: prevention, response, and recovery. Int J Sci Res Civ Eng. 2023;7(3):117–30.
47. Patel R, Varma K. Risk-based inspection and maintenance of subsea pipelines in high-value hydrocarbon developments. Structures. 2023;47:1234–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2022.11.085
48. Pimentel G, Castro R. Risk-informed life-cycle management of offshore hydrocarbon structures. Reliab Eng Syst Saf. 2020;197:106821. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2020.106821
49. Qin Y, Wu J. Stochastic optimization of hydrocarbon production under subsurface geological uncertainty. Comput Chem Eng. 2020;135:106752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2020.106752
50. Quevedo V, Sanchez M. Quantitative risk assessment of gas kicks during deepwater drilling. Saf Sci. 2022;145:105512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2021.105512
51. Ribeiro J, Costa A. The role of digital twins in subsurface risk mitigation. Autom Constr. 2023;148:104754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2023.104754
52. Rodriguez M, Garcia F. Economic risk assessment of high-value hydrocarbon developments in volatile markets. Energy Econ. 2022;112:106145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2022.106145
53. Sambo C, Abubakar S. Integrated reservoir-to-surface risk assessment: a framework for field development planning. J Pet Explor Prod Technol. 2021;11:2801–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13202-021-01198-3
54. Soares F, Teixeira M. Evaluating technical risk in subsea boosting and separation systems. Ocean Eng. 2021;228:108923. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2021.108923
55. Tan X, Cheng L. Multi-objective mitigation of environmental and technical risks in offshore drilling. J Loss Prev Process Ind. 2024;87:105214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2023.105214
56. Usman A, Lawal M. Subsurface risk quantification for Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) integrated with EOR. Greenh Gases Sci Technol. 2022;12(3):415–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/ghg.2154
57. Uzun O, Demir S. Multi-layer fuzzy risk assessment for onshore hydrocarbon facilities. J Loss Prev Process Ind. 2024;88:105267.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2024.105267

58. Valente G, Rossi P. Integrating legal and technical risk in offshore hydrocarbon licensing. Mar Policy. 2022;136:104889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104889
59. Velez J, Rios S. A systemic review of subsurface risk management in the Latin American oil and gas industry. Oil Gas Sci Technol. 2023;78:15. https://doi.org/10.2516/ogst/2023010
60. Wang L, Zhang Q. Data-driven subsurface risk assessment using multi-fidelity simulation. J Comput Phys. 2020;418:109632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2020.109632
61. Wu S, Li Z. Reliability analysis of subsea production systems under subsurface uncertainty. Front Energy Res. 2020;8:142. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2020.00142
62. Xiao Y, Chen G. Subsurface risk evaluation for hydrogen storage in depleted hydrocarbon reservoirs. Int J Hydrogen Energy. 2023;48(25):9412–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.12.045
63. Xu T, Pruess K. Coupled thermal-hydrological-mechanical-chemical (THMC) modeling for subsurface risk evaluation. Geomech Energy Environ. 2021;25:100212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gete.2020.100212
64. Yang D, Zhou Y. Advanced history matching for subsurface uncertainty quantification in high-value gas reservoirs. J Nat Gas Sci Eng. 2022;102:104578. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jngse.2022.104578
65. Zarrouk S, Moon H. Risk quantification in high-temperature subsurface energy developments. Geothermics. 2021;94:102123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geothermics.2021.102123
66. Zhang T, Sun S. A review of artificial intelligence applications in subsurface reservoir characterization and risk mitigation. Fuel. 2023;332:126156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2022.126156
67. Zhao Y, Liu J. Risk-informed decision-making for complex hydrocarbon development projects. Reliab Eng Syst Saf. 2021;210:107524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2021.107524
68. Zhou Q, Oldenburg C. Quantifying subsurface leakage risks using a multi-layer analytical framework. Int J Greenh Gas Control. 2020;95:102951. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2020.102951