aggradation angle, progradation and faulting are visible in the plot. Three clusters can be identified in the histogram of Figure 10a with medium, high and extreme pressure values. In Figure 11a, a small group of cases show lower pressures, while most of cases are distributed around the mean value (which reads 300 bar). We define the average well pressure elevation at time  $t_c$  as the temporal average of the

Figures 10a and 11a for different injection scenarios and average aquifer pressure at 2.4 hours after the start of injection is plotted for all cases in Figures 10b and 11b. In the rateconstrained scenario, high ranges of average pressure are observed (Figure 10b). Effects of

difference between the bottom-hole pressure  $P_w$  and the average aquifer pressure  $P_a$ :

 $\bar{\Delta P} = \left[ \int_0^{t_c} (P_w - \bar{P}_a) \, \mathrm{d}t \right] / t_c.$ (1)Histograms of well pressure elevation values are shown in Figures 12a and 13a. Higher values

imply a poor injectivity of the medium. We see in Figure 12 that maintaining the target rate will in many cases require a huge pressure elevation (up to 1400 bar in the worst cases) that would not be feasible nor possible to obtain. Pressure control on the injector reduces the range of pressure elevation variation below 170 bar. The average injector pressure elevation is plotted for all cases in Figures 12b and 13b. Two regions can be identified in the medium, the region near the injection point; and the

part of aquifer which is far from the injection point. The well-bore pressure is effected directly by heterogeneities in the near well-bore region, while the larger scale region influences the

average aquifer pressure. Pressure elevation variations in Figures 12a and 12b are influenced by the heterogeneity near the well-bore, where the reaction to injecting a fixed amount of  $CO_2$ starts by a local pressure build-up. Heterogeneity on the scale of aquifer plays a considerable

role in the range of variations in Figures 13a and 13b. In the pressure-constrained scenario, local pressure is controlled by putting a constraint on the well. Hence, the pressure elevation variations are controlled by the average aquifer pressure.

As we see in Figure 12b, low aggradation angle and down-dip progradations result in a poor injectivity and high pressure buildup in the injector. Vertical transmissibility drops dramatically for low aggradation angles [1]. This restricts the pressure transfer within the injection layer, and therefore the pressure builds up locally around the well. Moreover, in

cases with down-dip progradation the low permeability rocks surrounding river branches near the injector result in a local pressure buildup.

A group of cases in Figure 13 have a relatively low pressure elevation of less than 50 bar. These cases have a good injection quality, and the pressure is released through open boundaries easier than other cases. The rest of the cases show higher pressure elevation because of the heterogeneities in the larger scale, far from the injector. These results are obtained for a fixed injection location to examine the geological uncertainty impact on injectivity. In prac-

tice, the injector must be drilled and completed in the best formation with highest possible injectivity.

Faults influence both local pressure build-up near the injector as well as the average aquifer pressure. Therefore, they have a visible trend in many cases in Figures 12b and 13b

(for example, see the three cases denoted by red circles in the right end of Figure 12b). This is specially more apparent in cases with high level of barriers.