

# Advancements and Perspectives in Embedded Discrete Fracture Models (EDFM)

Renato Poli<sup>1</sup>, Marcos Vitor Barbosa Machado<sup>2</sup>, and Kamy Sepehrnoori<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The University of Texas at Austin, 200 E. Dean Keeton St., Austin, TX 78712, United States

<sup>2</sup>Petrobras, Petroleo Brasileiro S.A., 28 Henrique Valadares Av., Tower B, 6th Floor, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

## ABSTRACT

Embedded Discrete Fracture Model (EDFM) has emerged as a prominent technology to embed the hydraulic behavior of rock joints in reservoir numerical models. This paper critically reviews the latest developments and opportunities for further research. The literature is extensive when it comes to novel algorithms attempting to reach more accurate and computationally effective estimates. While hydraulic fracture models seem suitable for their purposes, we see simplistic and unrealistic setups to validate and assess naturally fractured reservoirs. This paper starts discussing of fractures as physical features and the primary mechanisms to be considered when mapping them into the numerical simulators. EDFM looks like a promising approach to modeling capillary continuity and buoyancy effects in a multiphase, multicomponent environment, whereas major limitations still prevent it from massive adoption in actual commercial field designs. Finally, we identify a lack of public-domain realistic benchmarks that can validate the actual potential of each method.

**Keywords:** EDFM, Naturally Fractured Reservoirs, Embedded fractures, Discrete Fracture Models, Reservoir flow simulation, Numerical methods

## INTRODUCTION

Significant hydrocarbon reserves are produced from Naturally Fractured Reservoirs (NFR) and Hydraulic Fractured (HF) wells. Using numerical models to characterize, forecast, and support design decisions is currently common practice. Numerical models are tools for engineers and geoscientists to test hypotheses and increase understanding of reservoir behavior in an effort to drive sensible decisions and communicate with stakeholders. The modeling technique to use depends on data availability and the physical understanding of the problem under analysis (Starfield and Cundall, 1988). The design tradeoff in discrete fracture modeling is to avoid excessive complexity without denying the existence and relevance of the joints. The design starts from the physical description of the joints, which is unique for each accumulation. Fractures can be (i) essential for drainage, (ii) permeability enhancement features, or even (iii) negatively impact fluid flow as barriers (Nelson, 2001).

The fundamental classification of fractures regards their genesis, whether they are originally present in the field as Natural Fractures (NFs) or artificially man-made features as Hydraulic Fractures (HF). While NFs are sparsely distributed on the reservoir domain, Hydraulic Fractures (HF) are stimulation techniques to enhance the well-reservoir coupling. The literature is comprehensive in both cases. We emphasize the importance of considering HF and NF in distinct ways because of their unique spatial position and geometry with respect to the field pressure gradient distribution.

There is reasonable information on fracture attributes for HF modeling: their geometries are anticipated as a design parameter, and their permeabilities are a consequence of the proppant or can be estimated from the residual aperture. While dealing with NFs, however, the fracture network geometry and hydraulic conductivity are highly uncertain, fundamentally based on geosciences conceptualization and analogs. Unlike intact rock, it is impractical to sample fractures or keep their in situ conditions behavior on the way to the laboratory. Hence, numerical calibration eventually relies on production data that cannot characterize individual joints but rather the overall behavior of the network as an equivalent continuous. The lack of physical meaning of the parameters may lead history-matching into unpredictable results Sahimi (1993).

Intuitively, we cannot expect a single model to fit all possible NF scenarios. A thorough geologic understanding and the genesis of the fractures are the definite starting point. A multidisciplinary team must investigate and promote sensible data acquisition from production instruments, logs, laboratory, and well-testing. Data interpretation and statistical analysis must be used sensibly together as drawing conclusions over deterministic or long single runs is misleading, as they offer little or no

predictability (Nelson, 2001). Hence, probabilistic models, sensitivity analyses, and history matching are preferred and demand fast optimization loops.

The challenge is, therefore, to navigate existing technologies to enable physically consistent fracture-aware workflows, providing fast assessment cycles while coping with high uncertainties. While we understand each technology has its own application niche, we focus our attention on recent progress in developing Embedded Discrete Fracture Models (EDFM). EDFM has received significant attention in the past decade, with significant advancements reported. The idea to embed fractures as nonconforming entities into existing models has proven to accurately solve field-scale models with notable performance (Yu et al., 2021).

This paper is organized as follows: first, we brief the physics conceptualization of fracture and rock joints and the important physics to include in their numerical counterparts. Then, we critically review the history and state-of-the-art of fracture models and EDFM. Along with the discussion of the recent progress, we identify open issues and potential areas of research interest.

## Fractures as physical features

Fractures are defined as *breaks or mechanical discontinuities in rock that consist of two rough surfaces in partial contact (...) complex in shape and often filled with mineral precipitates or transport materials* (Viswanathan et al., 2022). Their occurrence is linked to deformation after mechanical stress or to physical diagenesis (Nelson, 2001). If connected void spaces are present along the fracture, they may comprise low porosity fluid conduits, potentially being a primary drainage mechanism of the reservoir. However, if the crack is filled with fine impermeable material, it may restrict fluid transmissibility significantly perpendicularly to its faces.

A Naturally Fractured Reservoir (NFR) is defined as a reservoir in which *naturally occurring fractures either have or are predicted to have a significant effect on reservoir fluid flow* (Nelson, 2001). Narr et al. (2006) classifies NFRs according to the relevance of the fractures to the fluid flow: Type 1 - fractures provide essential porosity and permeability; Type 2 - fractures provide essential permeability; Type 3 - fractures provide permeability assistance. Identifying the NFR type is the first step to optimally translate the fractures into the models. In type 1, for example, the fracture network controls the overall reservoir drainage, likely with fluid channeling and slow matrix imbibition; in type 3, on the other limit, fluid flow is likely to occur more homogeneously, as matrix-matrix flow is non-negligible.

Man-made HF are engineering-designed and positioned across the well to enhance well productivity or injectivity. They are mostly considered tensile in nature and are supported either by added proppant or wall roughness in case of nonuniform acidizing. The uncertainties in HF geometry are bounded by operational parameters, analog wells, well logs, and pressure tests. It is reasonable to assume planar geometry, although some authors show HF is rarely planar and is, in fact, a complex network to be calibrated to an effective planar representation (Fisher et al., 2005; Gale et al., 2024; Guerrero et al., 2022; Manchanda et al., 2020).

Natural Fractures (NF) studies present absolutely distinct challenges. NF genesis is multifactorial, resulting in wide ranges of uncertainties and site-dependent behavior. NF can be cemented or open, span from seismic to millimetric scales, be interconnected or standalone, etc., so that rules of thumb do not apply (Aguilera, 1998). Authors have tried for many years to find correlations to get an understanding of the hydraulic behavior through estimates of fracture aperture, rugosity, contact area, and geometry with limited success (Viswanathan et al., 2022; Candela et al., 2012). Nevertheless, the lubrication theory (also known as the *cubic law*) is often used to characterize fluid flow inside a NF, even though the complexity of NF networks departs by far from the assumptions behind the equations. In fact, recent work shows that the cubic law estimates result in up to 100 times excessive transmissibility and cannot forecast the varied degrees of flow anisotropy seen in a typical fracture network (Frash et al., 2019; Oliveira et al., 2019).

As HF are designed to be major fluid channels to the well, large pressure gradients are expected from the fracture to the surrounding matrix. In this case, cubic law may approximate reasonably and viscous fluid transport is likely to control the fracture-matrix fluid exchange. In NF, on the other hand, pressure gradients are typically not expected to be significant across matrix blocks due to the small pressure gradient along the surrounding fractures. In these cases, capillary continuity, buoyancy, and multiphase interaction physics become more relevant than Darcy's straightforward viscous flow. Designers must now consider various mechanisms, like counter- and co-current flows and capillary continuity. (Blunt, 2017; Firoozabadi, 2000; Bina et al., 2020). Although intrinsically scale-dependent, building up a solid laboratory test program is the key to understanding the reservoir's fundamental drainage mechanisms, and results must be used after upscaling considerations (Lemonnier and Bourbiaux, 2010; Horie et al., 1990).

## 92 Fractures as numerical entities

93 Mathematical models of fractured reservoirs date back to the 1960s (Barenblatt et al., 1960; Warren and Root, 1963). The  
94 early models represented fractures as a collection of joints with regular geometry approximated by an effective continuum.  
95 Barenblatt et al. (1960) understood the need to deal with the fracture collection as a whole, considering it impractical to model  
96 each fracture individually. At the time, the models were targeted to transient well test interpretations of naturally fractured  
97 conventional reservoirs, and authors could define two numerical parameters to describe the network dynamics: a characteristic  
98 time and a characteristic distance. After that, following the evolution and commercial adoption of flow simulators, more interest  
99 was seen in numerical models for fractures, using the idealized concepts as a basis for the framework.

100 Long et al. (1982) discussed the scale of the fractures and their interconnectivity in high permeability large-scale paths. From  
101 the author's perspective, single fractures are only relevant as segments of large features and won't significantly impact global  
102 system drainage unless combined into large-scale effective elements. Kazemi et al. (1976) and Gilman and Kazemi (1983)  
103 extended the model to multiphase to account for capillary forces, which were not considered so far, and formulated the  
104 multiphase mathematical background still used today in modern simulators.

105 The multiphase physics was further investigated by Hinkley and Davis (1986) and more recently by Elputranto and Yucel Akkutlu  
106 (2020), who was concerned with capillary end effects in fractured tight rocks. The issue is that the capillary pressure  
107 discontinuity, as idealized in early models, may mislead the analysis. As natural fractures are distributed irregularly, much  
108 more capillary continuity is expected than in idealized geometries. That means one can expect a significant contribution from  
109 gravity-driven co-current flows and an environment more favorable to recovery factor (Firoozabadi, 2000; Cardwell Jr and  
110 Parsons, 1949; Labastie, 1990; Horie et al., 1990).

111 Different numerical techniques were proposed for modeling discrete fractures across a continuum, but the literature does  
112 not uniformly name these techniques. We understand there are two major fracture model classes: (1) conforming and (2)  
113 non-conforming. In conforming fracture models, the features are explicitly represented in the numerical mesh, while in  
114 non-conforming models, they are embedded as an equivalent continuum with no impact in the original mesh.

115 Most conforming meshes algorithms represent the fractures as elements reduced (or mixed) in dimensions – i.e., 2D elements in  
116 a 3D environment or 1D elements in a 2D environment. It benefits from the fact that the fracture width is orders of magnitude  
117 smaller than its length and height. Moreover, no significant pressure drop or flow is expected inside the fracture along the  
118 thin axis; hence, this dimension may be reduced analytically. This approach is typically used for smaller domains, and any  
119 modification in fracture geometry requires re-meshing and costly model re-processing.

120 Non-conforming approaches are preferred in field scale models where performance is critical, and fracture geometries carry high  
121 uncertainty. In this case, fractures are embedded in the continuum either as an effective medium or by introducing additional  
122 Representative Elementary Volumes (REV) for each fracture, like in EDFM. In both cases, an upscaling process is used to find  
123 the equivalent continua for the Discrete Fracture Network (DFN), later calibrated during data assimilation (interchangeably  
124 known as history matching).

125 Accurate results have been reported in conforming and non-conforming techniques for large-scale fractures with known  
126 geometries. In the case of diffuse fracture geometries, many features are present, and discrete fracture models may add too  
127 many degrees of freedom to the model. As the approach works for small models, field-scale models may become overcomplex  
128 and counterproductive, and design teams may lose intellectual control of the model. In this case, embedding fractures in the  
129 continua either by classic models or upscaled effective discrete models is generally more sensible.

130 For completeness, Table 1 lists popular fracture models, but details of each are beyond the scope of this paper. Recent  
131 benchmarks on them are found in Berre et al. (2021) and Flemisch et al. (2018).

## 132 Fundamental EDFM formulation



133 This section reviews the EDFM history and common grounds. Extensive discussion and validation of the technique are found in  
134 Sepehrnoori et al. (2020); Moinfar et al. (2013); Xu et al. (2017).

135 To our knowledge, the first use of the EDFM principles was proposed by Hearn et al. (1997) and, a few years later, by Lee et al.  
136 (2001) and Li and Lee (2008). At the time, formulations were limited to Cartesian meshes and simplified fracture geometries.  
137 Moinfar et al. (2013) expanded the idea for 3D with inclined fractures and proposed the EDFM naming for the method family.  
138 In the coming years, many researchers expanded EDFM in different directions by incorporating more complex mesh setups and  
139 fracture geometries, chemo-thermo-mechanics, and new formulations in various target applications.

140 EDFM workflow starts by characterizing the fracture network as a set of discrete lower dimensional entities (2D in a 3D model

**Table 1.** Relevant fracture models published in the literature.

Non-conforming	Effective continuum model	(Wu, 1999)
	Warren and Root	(Warren and Root, 1963)
	Multiporosity	(Bai et al., 1993; Abdassah and Ershaghi, 1986)
	MINC	(Pruess and Narasimhan, 1985)
	EDFM	(Moinfar et al., 2013)
Conforming	pEDFM	(Tene et al., 2017)
	cEDFM	(Chai, 2018)
	XFEM	(Fumagalli and Scotti, 2012)
	Lower-dimensional elements	(Karimi-Fard et al., 2004; Oda, 1986)

or 1D in a 2D model). Additional Representative Elementary Volumes (REV) are assigned for each effective discrete entity and the new REV's are then analytically connected to the geometrically co-located elements by redefining element connectivity. As the fracture REV's are not present in the mesh of matrix elements, special non-neighboring connections link the fracture REV's to the original matrix ones. Conventional well-established reservoir flow simulators can then solve the new model, in such a way that the original EDFM engines can be seen as a preprocessor.

The elementary entity of the method is a fracture segment, defined as the slice of a given fracture intersecting a matrix block. The segment will be associated with a new REV, with an assigned fluid volume and connectivity to the matrix blocks. The REV porosity represents the fluid volume and is defined as

$$\phi_f = \frac{wS}{V_b}, \quad (1)$$

where  $w$  is the fracture aperture,  $S$  is the surface area of the segment, and  $V_b$  is the bulk volume of the numerical element in which the segment will be represented.

We remark that, in field scale models,  $w$  is in the order of millimeters, whereas  $V_b$  is typically in the  $10^2 - 10^6 m^3$  range. Hence,  $\phi_f$  will tend to be small and drive the solver into numerical issues. It is a common practice to set a lower bound to  $\phi_f$  to avoid numerical issues.

The additional connectivity (or transmissibility) to be added to the model must account for (i) the fluid flow throughout the interconnected fracture segments  $T_F$ ; (ii) the fluid flow between intersecting fractures  $T_I$ ; and (iii) the fluid flow from the fracture to the surrounding matrix block  $T_{FM}$ .

The flow equations formulation for two segments of the same fracture follows a two-point flux approximation that is

$$T_F = \frac{T_i + T_j}{T_i T_j}, \quad T_i = \kappa_f \frac{A_i}{d_i}, \quad T_j = \kappa_f \frac{A_j}{d_j}, \quad (2)$$

where  $T_i$  and  $T_j$  are the transmissibility of each segment to their contact,  $\kappa_f$  stands for the fracture permeability,  $A_i$  is the contact area between the two segments, and  $d_i$  is the distance from the fracture centroid to the common face.

In case of fracture intersection, the transmissibility is


$$T_I = \kappa_f \frac{w_i L_i}{d_{ij}}, \quad d_{ij} = \frac{\int_{S_i} x_n dS_i + \int_{S_j} x_n dS_j}{S_i + S_j}, \quad (3)$$

where  $w_i$  is the fracture aperture,  $L_i$  is the length of the intersecting segment, and  $d_{ij}$  is the distance from the segment centroid to the intersection line  $j$ .

Finally, the transmissibility from the fracture to the surrounding matrix block is geometrically estimated as

$$T_{FM} = \frac{2A_f(\kappa_M \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{n}}{d_{FM}}, \quad d_{FM} = \frac{\int_V x_n dV}{V}, \quad (4)$$

where  $A_f$  is the area of the fracture segment open to flow,  $\mathbf{n}$  is the vector normal to the fracture surface,  $\kappa_M$  is the matrix permeability tensor,  $d_{FM}$  is the normal average distance between the fracture and the matrix,  $x_n$  is the shortest distance measured from each infinitesimal volume in  $V$  to the fracture plane (see Fig. 1).



**Figure 1.** A fracture segment crossing a matrix block.

As described, the original developments in EDFM could represent planar fractures in 2D Cartesian meshes. Later, the technology was deployed towards more complex mesh descriptions, namely corner point (Xu et al., 2019) and unstructured grids (Xu et al., 2020). The novel formulations enabled mixed representations: that is, fractures can now be represented by lower dimensional and by embedded elements on the same numerical framework. Moreover, preexisting models may now be used as bases for EDFM studies, avoiding costly mesh conversions.

Limitations on fracture geometry were overcome by (Xu et al., 2017). They enabled the representation of complex fracture networks, especially those estimated by hydraulic fracture simulators. The idea was applied both to curved hydraulic fractures and complex natural networks.

### Low-permeability fractures

As discussed previously, fracture simulation techniques were originally thought of to incorporate additional flow permeability into the existing matrix REV. However, natural fractures appear in different flavors: while continuous open joints enhance fluid flow, cemented fractures are restrictions.

The ability to deal with low-permeability fractures using EDFM was proposed by Tene et al. (2017) by the name of Projection-based EDFM (pEDFM). The idea is to penalize the original Matrix-to-Matrix transmissibilities at the cell interfaces (Fig. 2a). pEDFM adds value to history matching and uncertainty assessment, as the overall mesh is kept static, enabling fast optimization loops even with extreme anisotropy ratios.

pEDFM projects the fracture path at the matrix cells' interfaces along each dimension  $x_e$ , with surface areas  $A_{if \perp x_e}$ . The M-M transmissibilities are

$$T_{ii_e} = \kappa_{ii_e} \frac{A_{ii_e} - A_{if \perp x_e}}{\Delta x_e} \quad (5)$$


where  $\kappa_{ii_e}$  is the fluid mobility between the matrix cell  $i$  and its neighbor in direction  $x_e$ . The fracture transmissibilities enhancements are similar to the base EDFM technique, except that they are projected to the matrix cell interfaces as

$$T_{ief} = \kappa_{ief} \frac{A_{if \perp x_e}}{d_{ief}}. \quad (6)$$

We note that the limiting condition of a fluid-blocking fracture would represent a split between the reservoir volumes. As it makes sense, a significant error emerges if large cells are used. One might also consider that volumes might be confined between two blocking fractures if they are mapped to opposing faces of the volume, which would not be physical or would drop excessive volume apart. Such an approach suggests that pEDFM requires fine meshes when dealing with flow-blocking fractures.

Chai (2018) advances in that direction with the Compartmental EDFM (cEDFM), which enables unstructured cell volume split (2b). In cEDFM, the matrix REV is split into separate domains, one on each fracture side, following unstructured subgrids. The splitting process conceptualizes a connection map in which the REV. s are represented as nodes and the transmissibilities as edges. Details of the cEDFM formulation follow the same fundamentals of EDFM and are out of the scope of this manuscript.

Although cEDFM was validated in a proprietary simulator with the freedom to modify the core code, it seems possible to implement it as a preprocessor of commercial simulators, following the original EDFM strategy. However, the number of new volume domains increases with the network's complexity. Upscaling techniques starting from cEDFM connectivity graph looks promising, but we are unaware of any work on the subject.



**Figure 2.** A fracture segment crossing a matrix block.

## Enhanced transmissibility calculation

Significant effort has been devoted to improving transmissibility calculations. It is the case in the Integrally EDFM (iEDFM) (Shao and Di, 2018), where the fracture network inside a given block is considered altogether in a simple yet powerful upscaling technique. The advantage is to reduce the number of new REV's and connectivity as neighboring fractures are merged. Similarly, there has also been progress in using multiscale simulations to compute the transmissibility calculations, which would allow for the numerical incorporation of complex physics into the field-scale models. Losapio and Scotti (2023) developed an algorithm in that direction. However, the solution is costly and significantly increases the design optimization loops. We agree with the author that this might be an interesting research topic for machine learning and artificial intelligence algorithms.

The pitfall of most of the EDFM transmissibilities calculation strategies is disregarding multiphase aspects and relying on highly uncertain data. After all, field data reveals the connectivity among the joints only globally and in later times when the field is already developed. Pursuing highly accurate characterization without reliable data for calibration is pointless. One alternative is to build up local fine-grained and physically rich models, more suitable to address phenomenological approaches. The idea would be to enhance overall physical understanding and constrain the uncertainties of large-scale models. This looks like a fruitful research topic to be explored, especially considering data-driven multiscale strategies.

## Geological considerations

Fracture modeling is an area with poor and highly uncertain calibration data regarding quality and spatiality. The predictability of a fracture model eventually relies on the physical understanding of the problem derived from geoscience studies. That means that the quality of a model is directly linked to its ability to enhance multidisciplinary communication and implement and test high-level understandings of the fracture network attributes. Hence, design cycles and numerical methodologies must include the geosciences and humanistic interventions, both in adding new interpretations to the models and getting feedback from them.

It is challenging or even impossible to build a generic correlation between fracture geometry and hydraulic behavior, and the simplistic idea of fracture flow controlled by average apertures and planar geometries is unrealistic. A geometrical description must include, besides the fracture large-scale geometry path, at least its roughness, aperture, contact area, and history (Viswanathan et al., 2022). Frash et al. (2019) and Pyrak-Nolte et al. (1987) show, for example, that the lubrication theory in parallel plates (cubic law) is not applicable for natural fractures, as a geometry-to-transmissibility correlation is complex and the lubrication theory assumptions are excessively restrictive. Besides, laboratory investigations have important scale and mechanical limitations that usually invalidate the findings.

Hence, the design team must agree on the nature of the fracture network and essential attributes before assigning fracture conductivity. Even though EDFM provides a framework to model discrete fractures, one must be aware of detaching the geometry of the fracture from its numerical counterpart. As much as W&R models map complex natural fracture networks as a continuum by assuming the geometry of regularly spaced cubic blocks, discrete fractures must be interpreted as numerical representations of interconnected multiscale joints. The best approach to our knowledge is to seek higher-level parameters in geosciences to characterize the fracture network as effective features.




## Multiphase flow

The drainage mechanisms in a flow simulator are the forces in the domain that control the rock and fluid interactions. The major forces to consider in a given porous media are gravitational, viscous, and capillary. Their preponderance in the overall



equilibrium varies with the composition of the materials, the geometry of the pore structure, the height of the reservoir, and the pressure gradients imposed, etc.

We note that the majority of research papers  address fluid flow inside fractures ignore capillary equilibrium. When calculations are performed in idealized geometries and multiphase flow is left open for the reader's discretion, the authors suggest that considering capillary pressure and relative permeability as a function of fluid saturation is enough to embed multiphase physics into the NFR numerical models. However, in naturally fractured reservoirs, discussions on capillary continuity, spontaneous imbibition, counter-current and co-current flow patterns, and their numerical consistency remain open (Lemonnier and Bourbiaux, 2010; Labastie, 1990; Saidi, 1983).

As relative permeability embeds capillary-controlled behavior into larger scale Darcy's viscous flow formulation (Cense and Berg, 2009), its use in NFR is not straightforward. When derived from laboratory tests, relative permeabilities map the behavior along the matrix. Similarly, along the fractures, capillary pressure is routinely considered negligible, and relative permeabilities as set as linear, close to an X shape. However, relevant work by Firoozabadi and Hauge (1990) and Karimi-Fard et al. (2004) show this is not always true and may produce over-pessimistic recovery estimates.

We know that the NFs subject to waterflooding imbibition dynamics enhance oil recovery in a water-wet NFR but are minimal in strongly oil-wet formation. In mixed wet rocks, the oil recovery can be more favorable than the WW scenarios (Karimi-Fard et al., 2004; Blunt, 2017; Alhammedi et al., 2017), and it must be underlined that although laboratory testing of fractured rock is not trivial, it is essential to describe the imbibition mechanisms in the small scale. In fact, the assumption that fluid flow in an NFR occurs mainly inside fractures breaks down when multiphase effects are considered (Wu, 2015): as the capillary pressure inside fractures is usually non-negligible, capillary continuity throughout a fracture set is probably greater than anticipated, gravity and co-current flow play a role as primary drainage mechanisms and imbibition of the natural fractures delay the water breakthrough. Fracture models must go beyond simplistic idealized geometries to find representative realistic estimates.

Wu et al. (2004) further discusses potential numerical issues. Finite difference flow simulators use upstream approximations for the derivatives as a numerical stabilization technique. This implies that the fracture's relative permeability dominates the process when fluid flows from the fracture to the matrix. This is unrealistic, as the permeability of the most restrictive block controls the equivalent permeability between two blocks with contrasting permeability. The proposed solution is to model the fracture-matrix interface physics instead of relying on matrix and fracture parameters alone. While EDFM looks like an interesting approach to controlling capillary continuity and buoyancy of each numerical effective feature, a clear recommendation is still an open research area.

Finally, benchmarks and validation procedures for multiphase flow in NFRs are scarce, as work found in the literature tends to focus on the assessment of accuracy and performance of algorithms in single-phase flow scenarios (Berre et al., 2021; Flemisch et al., 2018). The strategy is indeed suitable for estimates related to stimulated wells and hydraulic fractures but eventually misleads and oversimplifies the analysis for naturally fractured reservoirs.

## Transient Thermo-Mechanic-Hydraulic (THM) applications

Most of the advancements seen in EDFM lately relate to applications beyond hydraulic flow. Pei (2022) has recently used EDFM to model fully coupled mechanics and hydraulic flow, which can handle time-dependent aspects of fracture transmissibility as a response to stress and pressure dynamics. Ren and Younis (2019) presented an algorithm to model isothermal complex fracture propagation in a hybrid XFEM-EDFM strategy. One key aspect is the ability to track the fracture path, an important degree of freedom in this class of algorithms. Despite the historical research effort, strategies for fracture tracking in THM-coupled processes in 3D are still not consolidated.

EDFM has also been extended to Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS), in which the coupling between energy exchange and fluid flow are primary for the design (Murphy, 1978; Ghassemi, 2012; Sun et al., 2021; Rao et al., 2022; ?). We note the relevance of not only the energy exchange along the reservoir but also the thermal stresses the system is subject to. Fracture understanding in EGS application differs significantly from stimulation jobs. As the latter are operated for a few hours with generally neglected localized thermal stresses, EGS operates for years, and thermally induced stresses likely propagate fractures in non-planar geometries. It is unclear how to map secondary fractures as an effective discrete fracture, and numerical simulation of the long-term propagation is still an area of active development.

Most simulators dealing with mechanical coupling restrict the analysis to linear time-dependent transmissibilities as a response to linear elasticity. That is, the fracture conductivity reduces as effective stresses rise due to depletion or cooling (de Sousa Junior et al., 2016; Pei, 2022). Proppant distribution and crushing due to elevated effective stresses have also been studied, for example, by Yu et al. (2015). However, nonlinear phenomena, such as plasticity, creep, hysteresis, and large strains, are often neglected or left as future work.

## Data assimilation under uncertainties

Fracture-aware workflows and optimization loops must cope with a highly uncertain characterization environment. Narrowing data uncertainty is an long term ongoing effort, although the physical attributes of the problem limits the range of success. The data assimilation and sensitivity analysis approach must consider probabilistic tools that can enhance understanding and provide reliable results under uncertainty. Estimating the uncertainty degree of each piece of information is challenging, but awareness is crucial to avoid time-consuming, over-accurate optimization processes that are impossible to calibrate.

As a matter of fact, the optimization method in use cannot assume the fracture network or individual fracture conductivities are known. A better approach is to consider every single simulation run as a probabilistic realization, to be interpreted as an intermediate result, to feed the global probabilistic interpretation. Moreover, designers must avoid the excessive number of parameters.

Depending on the scale of analysis, a fracture network may consist of thousands to millions of fractures. There is a need to control higher level parameters – like fracture genesis, large scale path, anisotropy or global transmissibility multipliers – to get control of the optimization process. In these loops, we must establish upscaling methods to control the fracture network in each realization. This open research field may take advantage of recent AI and multiscale data assimilation (Yu et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023).

The evolution of such algorithms and automatic history matching, e.g., by Canchumuni et al. (2021), show potential to reduce human interaction times. However, optimization workflows still demand visualization, assessment and validation in postprocessing, which is limiting for many applications of novel methods. Work by de Sousa Junior et al. (2016) is one example where visually interpreting coupled geomechanical processes in fractures was central.

We acknowledge that the use of EDFM in standard industry workflow is making progress, as the tools become more user friendly, fast, reliable and integrated on existing workflows. Pre and post processing tools, and optimization loops are likely the limiting ones for the time being. Consistent results visualization are essential for calibrating, extracting information and communicating with geoscientists and stakeholders.

## Performance and accuracy

Reservoir flow models are currently built of as many as 100 million active elements. As models grow, performance becomes an issue even for modern computers. EDFM has proven to be a computationally efficient framework to model discrete fractures, preventing local grid refinement while maintaining accuracy. We must regard especial attention to grid sensitivity of each algorithm. As EDFM and related models are supposed to be in opposition to local grid refinement, it loses value as the grid is refined. Effective techniques must be tested and validated for grid sensitivity and present accurate results with sufficient large meshes.

Yu et al. (2021) has stressed with success the idea of a large model with a million fractures. In single-phase benchmarks, it has also been competitive in accuracy and computational cost (Berre et al., 2021; Flemisch et al., 2018). We emphasize that, unlike most other methods, EDFM can use commercial simulator engines, meaning that multiphase behavior, complex thermodynamics, well control, pre and post processing and uncertainty analysis framework are available with no extra development.

As methodologies are proposed, benchmarking against simplistic approaches must be avoided, while we prefer to see commercial standards as references. For example, single-porosity or local grid refined (LGR) are rarely used in real-life simulations to model fractures. Instead, commercial software has consolidated dual-porosity W&R workflows, which work well for dense sets of NF. While there are known accuracy and performance limitations, we understand those as the reference to be improved by novel tentative algorithms.

To the best of our knowledge, there are no consistent public-domain benchmarks for multiphase flow assessment in fractured porous media. As discussed in previous sections, while single-phase tests are enough for Hydraulic Fractured Wells, that is certainly not true for Naturally Fractured Reservoirs. Proposing comprehensive, public-domain NFR benchmarks together with reference metrics for accuracy and computational performance is an important research area.

Finally, the validation of a given model must assess the ability of the model to *predicting the behavior of the reservoir*, in opposition to simply *history matching* the data. This may be true even for well-established dual-porosity models, in which many parameters are offered as degrees of freedom to history matching but may lack physical meaning and hence, predictability (Sahimi, 1993).



## Closure

This paper reviewed the latest development of EDFM frameworks, willing to identify important open issues and research opportunities. While progress in distinct directions of the technique is evident, fundamental issues remain open, especially related to the incorporation and validation of multiphase flow dynamics, physical description of natural fractures, large-scale problems, and uncertainty management. We believe one of the reasons for that is the topic's complexity, multidisciplinary, and notable distancing between geoscientists, petrophysicists, simulation engineers, and computer scientists.

The significant differences in drainage mechanisms between Naturally Fractured Reservoirs and Hydraulic Fractured Wells suggest that building oversimplified models or seeking a single formulation for both cases is counterproductive. A missing step in assessing state-of-the-art fracture modeling in its various flavors is settling on a comprehensive set of public-domain benchmarks covering a wide range of complex fracture networks, revealing each methodology's actual scalability and accuracy.

## REFERENCES

- Abdassah, D. and Ershaghi, I. (1986). Triple-porosity systems for representing naturally fractured reservoirs. *SPE Formation Evaluation*, 1(02):113–127.
- Aguilera, R. (1998). Geologic aspects of naturally fractured reservoirs. *The Leading Edge*, 17(12):1667–1670.
- Alhammedi, A. M., AlRatrou, A., Singh, K., Bijeljic, B., and Blunt, M. J. (2017). In situ characterization of mixed-wettability in a reservoir rock at subsurface conditions. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):10753.
- Bai, M., Elsworth, D., and Roegiers, J.-C. (1993). Multiporosity/multi-permeability approach to the simulation of naturally fractured reservoirs. *Water Resources Research*, 29(6):1621–1633.
- Barenblatt, G. I., Zheltov, I. P., and Kochina, I. (1960). Basic concepts in the theory of seepage of homogeneous liquids in fissured rocks [strata]. *Journal of applied mathematics and mechanics*, 24(5):1286–1303.
- Berre, I., Boon, W. M., Flemisch, B., Fumagalli, A., Gläser, D., Keilegavlen, E., Scotti, A., Stefansson, I., Tatomir, A., Brenner, K., et al. (2021). Verification benchmarks for single-phase flow in three-dimensional fractured porous media. *Advances in Water Resources*, 147:103759.
- Bina, O., Aminshahidy, B., Dadvar, M., and Moghadasi, J. (2020). Capillary continuity in fractured porous media; part ii: Evaluation of fracture capillary pressure in the presence of liquid bridges using a novel microfluidic approach. *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, 314:113666.
- Blunt, M. J. (2017). *Multiphase flow in permeable media: A pore-scale perspective*. Cambridge university press.
- Canchumuni, S. W., Castro, J. D., Potratz, J., Emerick, A. A., and Pacheco, M. A. C. (2021). Recent developments combining ensemble smoother and deep generative networks for facies history matching. *Computational Geosciences*, 25:433–466.
- Candela, T., Renard, F., Klinger, Y., Mair, K., Schmittbuhl, J., and Brodsky, E. E. (2012). Roughness of fault surfaces over nine decades of length scales. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 117(B8).
- Cardwell Jr, W. and Parsons, R. (1949). Gravity drainage theory. *Transactions of the AIME*, 179(01):199–215.
- Cense, A. and Berg, S. (2009). The viscous-capillary paradox in 2-phase flow in porous media. In *International Symposium of the Society of Core Analysts held in Noordwijk, The Netherlands*, pages 27–30.
- Chai, Z. (2018). *An Efficient Method for Fractured Shale Reservoir Simulation & History Matching: The CEDFM Approach*. PhD thesis.
- de Sousa Junior, L. C., dos Santos, L. O. S., de Souza Rios, V., Araújo, C., Celes, W., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2016). Methodology for geomechanically controlled transmissibility through active natural fractures in reservoir simulation. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 147:7–14.
- Elputranto, R. and Yucel Akkutlu, I. (2020). Near-fracture capillary end effect on shale-gas and water production. *SPE Journal*, 25(04):2041–2054.
- Firoozabadi, A. (2000). Recovery mechanisms in fractured reservoirs and field performance. *Journal of Canadian Petroleum Technology*, 39(11).
- Firoozabadi, A. and Hauge, J. (1990). Capillary pressure in fractured porous media (includes associated papers 21892 and 22212). *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, 42(06):784–791.
- Fisher, M. K., Wright, C. A., Davidson, B. M., Steinsberger, N. P., Buckler, W. S., Goodwin, A., and Fielder, E. O. (2005). Integrating fracture mapping technologies to improve stimulations in the barnett shale. *SPE Production & Facilities*, 20(02):85–93.
- Flemisch, B., Berre, I., Boon, W., Fumagalli, A., Schwenck, N., Scotti, A., Stefansson, I., and Tatomir, A. (2018). Benchmarks for single-phase flow in fractured porous media. *Advances in Water Resources*, 111:239–258.
- Frash, L. P., Carey, J. W., and Welch, N. J. (2019). Scalable en echelon shear-fracture aperture-roughness mechanism: Theory, validation, and implications. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 124(1):957–977.

- Fumagalli, A. and Scotti, A. (2012). A reduced model for flow and transport in fractured porous media with non-matching grids. In *Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications 2011: Proceedings of ENUMATH 2011, the 9th European Conference on Numerical Mathematics and Advanced Applications, Leicester, September 2011*, pages 499–507. Springer.
- Gale, J. F. W., Elliott, S. J., Rysak, B. G., and Laubach, S. E. (2024). The critical role of core in understanding hydraulic fracturing. *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 527(1):SP527–2021.
- Ghassemi, A. (2012). A review of some rock mechanics issues in geothermal reservoir development. *Geotechnical and Geological Engineering*, 30:647–664.
- Gilman, J. R. and Kazemi, H. (1983). Improvements in simulation of naturally fractured reservoirs. *Society of petroleum engineers Journal*, 23(04):695–707.
- Guerrero, J. O., Espinoza, D. N., and Gale, J. F. (2022). High resolution hfts2 slant core imaging through x-ray computed micro tomography. In *Unconventional Resources Technology Conference, 20–22 June 2022*, pages 880–897. Unconventional Resources Technology Conference (URTeC).
- Hearn, C. L., Al-Emadi, I. A. A., Worley, P. L., and Taylor, R. D. (1997). Improved oil recovery in a tight reservoir with conductive faults, isnd shuaiba, qatar. In *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition?*, pages SPE–38908. SPE.
- Hinkley, R. and Davis, L. (1986). Capillary pressure discontinuities and end effects in homogeneous composite cores: effect of flow rate and wettability. In *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition?*, pages SPE–15596. SPE.
- Horie, T., Firoozabadi, A., and Ishimoto, K. (1990). Laboratory studies of capillary interaction in fracture/matrix systems. *SPE Reservoir Engineering*, 5(03):353–360.
- Karimi-Fard, M., Durlowsky, L. J., and Aziz, K. (2004). An efficient discrete-fracture model applicable for general-purpose reservoir simulators. *SPE journal*, 9(02):227–236.
- Kazemi, H., Merrill Jr, L., Porterfield, K., and Zeman, P. (1976). Numerical simulation of water-oil flow in naturally fractured reservoirs. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal*, 16(06):317–326.
- Kim, H., Onishi, T., Chen, H., and Datta-Gupta, A. (2021). Parameterization of embedded discrete fracture models (edfm) for efficient history matching of fractured reservoirs. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 204:108681.
- Labastie, A. (1990). Capillary continuity between blocks of a fractured reservoir. In *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition?*, pages SPE–20515. SPE.
- Lee, S. H., Lough, M., , and Jensen, C. (2001). Hierarchical modeling of flow in naturally fractured formations with multiple length scales. *Water resources research*, 37(3):443–455.
- Lemonnier, P. and Bourbiaux, B. (2010). Simulation of naturally fractured reservoirs. state of the art-part 1–physical mechanisms and simulator formulation. *Oil & Gas Science and Technology–Revue de l’Institut Français du Pétrole*, 65(2):239–262.
- Li, L. and Lee, S. H. (2008). Efficient field-scale simulation of black oil in a naturally fractured reservoir through discrete fracture networks and homogenized media. *SPE Reservoir evaluation & engineering*, 11(04):750–758.
- Liu, C., Xie, H., Mao, Z., Yu, W., Li, N., Gong, Y., Leines, J., Miao, J., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2023). Edfm-ai for calibration of hydraulic and natural fracture geometry. In *ARMA US Rock Mechanics/Geomechanics Symposium*, pages ARMA–2023. ARMA.
- Long, J. C., Remer, J., Wilson, C., and Witherspoon, P. (1982). Porous media equivalents for networks of discontinuous fractures. *Water resources research*, 18(3):645–658.
- Losapio, D. and Scotti, A. (2023). Local embedded discrete fracture model (ledfm). *Advances in Water Resources*, 171:104361.
- Manchanda, R., Shrivastava, K., Zheng, S., and Sharma, M. (2020). A new mechanism for the formation of hydraulic fracture swarms. In *SPE Hydraulic Fracturing Technology Conference and Exhibition*, page D021S003R005. SPE.
- Moinfar, A., Sepehrnoori, K., Johns, R. T., and Varavei, A. (2013). Coupled geomechanics and flow simulation for an embedded discrete fracture model. In *SPE reservoir simulation symposium*. OnePetro.
- Murphy, H. D. (1978). Thermal stress cracking and the enhancement of heat extraction from fractured geothermal reservoirs. Technical report, Los Alamos National Lab.(LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States).
- Narr, W., Schechter, D. S., and Thompson, L. B. (2006). *Naturally fractured reservoir characterization*, volume 112. Society of Petroleum Engineers Richardson, TX.
- Nelson, R. A. (2001). *Geologic analysis of naturally fractured reservoirs*, volume 1. Gulf Professional Publishing.
- Oda, M. (1986). An equivalent continuum model for coupled stress and fluid flow analysis in jointed rock masses. *Water resources research*, 22(13):1845–1856.
- Oliveira, T. A., Cruz, N. M., Cruz, J. M., Cunha, R. S., and Matos, M. (2019). Faults, fractures and karst zones characterization in a pre-salt reservoir using geometric attributes. In *Sixteenth International Congress of the Brazilian Geophysical Society, Rio de Janeiro*, pages 19–22.
- Pei, Y. (2022). *Coupled geomechanics and multiphase flow modeling in naturally and hydraulically fractured reservoirs*. PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Pruess, K. and Narasimhan, T. (1985). A practical method for modeling fluid and heat flow in fractured porous media. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal*, 25(01):14–26.

- Pyrak-Nolte, L. J., Myer, L. R., Cook, N. G., and Witherspoon, P. A. (1987). Hydraulic and mechanical properties of natural fractures in low permeability rock. In *ISRM Congress*, pages ISRM-6CONGRESS. ISRM.
- Rao, X., Xin, L., He, Y., Fang, X., Gong, R., Wang, F., Zhao, H., Shi, J., Xu, Y., and Dai, W. (2022). Numerical simulation of two-phase heat and mass transfer in fractured reservoirs based on projection-based embedded discrete fracture model (pedfm). *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 208:109323.
- Ren, G. and Younis, R. M. (2019). A numerical method for hydraulic fracture propagation using embedded meshes. In *SPE Reservoir Simulation Conference*. OnePetro.
- Sahimi, M. (1993). Flow phenomena in rocks: from continuum models to fractals, percolation, cellular automata, and simulated annealing. *Reviews of modern physics*, 65(4):1393.
- Saidi, A. (1983). Simulation of naturally fractured reservoirs. In *SPE Reservoir Simulation Conference?*, pages SPE-12270. SPE.
- Sepehrnoori, K., Xu, Y., and Yu, W. (2020). *Embedded discrete fracture modeling and application in reservoir simulation*. Elsevier.
- Shao, R. and Di, Y. (2018). An integrally embedded discrete fracture model with a semi-analytic transmissibility calculation method. *Energies*, 11(12):3491.
- Starfield, A. M. and Cundall, P. (1988). Towards a methodology for rock mechanics modelling. In *International Journal of Rock Mechanics and Mining Sciences & Geomechanics Abstracts*, volume 25, pages 99–106. Elsevier.
- Sun, H., Yu, W., Wu, K., Sepehrnoori, K., and Miao, J. (2021). A powerful thermal-edfm for modeling enhanced geothermal system with 3d complex fracture networks. In *ARMA US Rock Mechanics/Geomechanics Symposium*, pages ARMA-2021. ARMA.
- Tene, M., Bosma, S. B., Al Kobaisi, M. S., and Hajibeygi, H. (2017). Projection-based embedded discrete fracture model (pedfm). *Advances in Water Resources*, 105:205–216.
- Viswanathan, H. S., Ajo-Franklin, J., Birkholzer, J. T., Carey, J. W., Guglielmi, Y., Hyman, J., Karra, S., Pyrak-Nolte, L., Rajaram, H., Srinivasan, G., et al. (2022). From fluid flow to coupled processes in fractured rock: Recent advances and new frontiers. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 60(1):e2021RG000744.
- Warren, J. E. and Root, P. J. (1963). The behavior of naturally fractured reservoirs. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal*, 3(03):245–255.
- Wu, Y. S. (1999). On the effective continuum method for modeling multiphase flow, multicomponent transport and heat transfer in fractured rock. Technical report, Berkeley National Laboratory, Earth Sciences Division.
- Wu, Y.-S. (2015). *Multiphase fluid flow in porous and fractured reservoirs*. Gulf professional publishing.
- Wu, Y.-S., Pan, L., and Pruess, K. (2004). A physically based approach for modeling multiphase fracture–matrix interaction in fractured porous media. *Advances in Water Resources*, 27(9):875–887.
- Xu, Y., Cavalcante Filho, J., Yu, W., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2017). Discrete-fracture modeling of complex hydraulic-fracture geometries in reservoir simulators. *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering*, 20(02):403–422.
- Xu, Y., Fernandes, B. R. B., Marcondes, F., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2019). Embedded discrete fracture modeling for compositional reservoir simulation using corner-point grids. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 177:41–52.
- Xu, Y., Lima, I. d. C. M., Marcondes, F., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2020). Development of an embedded discrete fracture model for 2d and 3d unstructured grids using an element-based finite volume method. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*, 195:107725.
- Yu, W., Gupta, A., Vaidya, R. N., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2021). Efficient modeling of unconventional well performance with millions of natural and hydraulic fractures using embedded discrete fracture model edfm. In *SPE Middle East Oil & Gas Show and Conference*. OnePetro.
- Yu, W., Tripoppoom, S., Sepehrnoori, K., and Miao, J. (2018). An automatic history-matching workflow for unconventional reservoirs coupling mcmc and non-intrusive edfm methods. In *SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition?*, page D031S040R002. SPE.
- Yu, W., Zhang, T., Du, S., and Sepehrnoori, K. (2015). Numerical study of the effect of uneven proppant distribution between multiple fractures on shale gas well performance. *Fuel*, 142:189–198.