

some conclusions based on the results. Integration of the BHA provider and vibratory tool manufacturer was an issue that had been seen in the past. Previous failures to the vibratory tool had caused fishing operations to take place. The BHA provider did not want to take responsibility for the failure because they did not supply the tool and the vibratory tool manufacturer did not want to take responsibility because they did not run the tool. Due to issues like this, the operator desired that the BHA provider manufactures, services, and supplies all equipment in the BHA.

Another factor taken into consideration was the vibratory tool's potential for failure. Fewer moving parts within the vibratory tool was thought of as a benefit to help prevent or mitigate any future problems relating to the vibratory tool.

With the above stipulations in mind, the operator felt most benefit was given to using the Fluidic Flow Modulating vibratory tool. This tool operates by using a specialized flow path to create varying flow resistance without the use of moving parts. Another advantage for the operator is that the coil tool company that has proven themselves as the preferred provider created this tool. With the Fluidic Flow Modulating vibratory tool being provided by the coil tool company, it eliminates any future third party liability problems. Along with these advantages, the operator felt like the Fluidic Flow Modulating vibratory tool operated extremely well through the drillout test.

Since the completion of the trial, all work has been given to the Fluidic Flow Modulating vibratory tool. The operator has drilled out 50+ wells without any issues.

Reference

Schultz, R. 2013. Good Vibrations. *Oil Field Technology* February 2013: 30-34