



Non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow: formulation, soil-atmosphere boundary condition and application to high energy geothermal simulations

Laurence Beade, Konstantin Brenner, Simon Lopez, Roland Masson, Farid Smai

► To cite this version:

Laurence Beade, Konstantin Brenner, Simon Lopez, Roland Masson, Farid Smai. Non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow: formulation, soil-atmosphere boundary condition and application to high energy geothermal simulations. Computational Geosciences, 2018, 23, pp.443-470. 10.1007/s10596-018-9794-9 . hal-01702391v1

HAL Id: hal-01702391

<https://hal.science/hal-01702391v1>

Submitted on 6 Feb 2018 (v1), last revised 17 Dec 2018 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow: formulation, soil-atmosphere boundary condition and application to high energy geothermal simulations

Laurence Beaudé · Konstantin Brenner · Simon Lopez ·
Roland Masson · Farid Smai

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract This article deals with the modelling and formulation of compositional gas liquid Darcy flow. Our model includes an advanced boundary condition at the interface between the porous medium and the atmosphere accounting for convective mass and energy transfer, liquid evaporation and liquid outflow. The formulation is based on a fixed set of unknowns whatever the set of present phases. The thermodynamic equilibrium is expressed as complementary constraints. The model and its formulation are applied to the simulation of the Bouillante high energy geothermal field in Guadeloupe characterized by a high temperature close to the surface.

Keywords Non-isothermal compositional Darcy flow; geothermal energy; soil-atmosphere boundary condition; outflow boundary condition; porous medium drying; finite volume scheme.

1 Introduction

Geothermal energy is a carbon-free non-intermittent energy source with low environmental impact. It will contribute to the decarbonization of our economy reaching its maximum mitigation potential by 2050 [2]. In countries with a favourable geological context, high temperature geothermal energy can make a significant contribution to power production and the world installed capacity is expected to double over the present decade [6]. As regards direct use, installed capacity growth follows exactly the same trend [25], with a conservative assesment showing that the annual recoverable geothermal energy is in the same order as the world current final energy consumption [24].

L. Beaudé
Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, INRIA COFFEE, Laboratoire J.A. Dieudonné, Parc Valrose, 06108 Nice cedex 02, France. E-mail: laurence.beaude@unice.fr

K. Brenner
Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, INRIA COFFEE, Laboratoire J.A. Dieudonné, Team Coffee, Parc Valrose, 06108 Nice cedex 02, France. E-mail: konstantin.brenner@unice.fr

S. Lopez
BRGM, scientific and Technical Center, 3 avenue Claude Guillemin, BP 36009, 45060 Orléans Cedex 2 France E-mail: s.lopez@brgm.fr

R. Masson
Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, INRIA COFFEE, Laboratoire J.A. Dieudonné, Team Coffee, Parc Valrose, 06108 Nice cedex 02, France. E-mail: roland.masson@unice.fr

F. Smai
BRGM, scientific and Technical Center, 3 avenue Claude Guillemin, BP 36009, 45060 Orléans Cedex 2 France E-mail: f.smai@brgm.fr

The quantitative understanding of the shallow parts of geothermal systems is challenging both for the exploration and exploitation of high energy geothermal resources. First, the unsaturated zone and/or cooler superficial water flows can considerably alter evidences of the presence of a deeper geothermal resource. In some cases, the resource may be totally hidden. In terms of exploitation, as some systems underlay urbanized areas (*e.g.* Rotuara in New Zealand or Bouillante in the French Carribean), resource exploitation much be carefully monitored and controlled in order to avoid unwanted induced surface manifestations or risks. Moreover, several features such as geysers, have a major cultural significance for indigenous populations and must therefore be protected and kept unaltered [33].

Numerical modeling has become essential in all phases of geothermal operations. It is used in the exploration phases to assess the geothermal potential, validate conceptual hypothesis and help well siting. Field development and resource management need quantitative estimation to prevent resource exhaustion and achieve its sustainable exploitation (production/injection scenarios). Finally, numerical modeling is also helpful in studying exploitation related industrial risks such as the interaction with shallow water levels (drinking water resources, hydrothermal vents or eruption) (*e.g.* [33]). The physics embedded in the numerical model correctly handle nonlinear evolution of saturation transients with water table fluctuations, high temperature gradients and phase change processes in the shallow levels of the simulation domain. In addition, simulation meshes must correctly capture topographic effects and have sufficient vertical resolutions in these areas.

Current software suffers several limitations in terms of boundary conditions which are known to play a major role in geothermal flows [34,31]. Mixed-type transient boundary conditions are not supported which impedes the convenient modeling of natural processes such as recharge or seepage or water table fluctuations. Workarounds may exist (*e.g.* [20]) but are relatively tedious to implement and are not formulated in a generic way. Transient complex upper or lower boundary conditions are mandatory to take into account some crucial processes. In volcanic island settings, the inland water table may be excessively deep and the interactions between the vadose zone and the fresh water recharge may hide geothermal resources ([11], [20]). In sedimentary basins the interactions with the topography and recharge areas must be correctly taken into account to reproduce head distributions at basin scale [16]. Though many groundwater simulation software can deal with the vadose zone, they are rarely designed to study multiphasic hydrothermal processes. Conversely, some geothermal reservoir simulators propose to take into account a gas/air component [32] but they are still restricted to rather simple boundary conditions and most of the time the alternative is between fixed value/Dirichlet type for all primary variables or fixed fluxes/Neumann type for all conserved quantities (*e.g.* [35]).

The objective of this work is to investigate a new formulation for non-isothermal compositional gas liquid Darcy flows and to couple it with an advanced soil-atmosphere boundary condition. The compositional model should typically account for the water component which can vaporize into the gas phase and for a set of gaseous components which can dissolve into the liquid phase. The soil-atmosphere boundary condition, based on mole and energy balance equations set at the interface, should take into account the vaporization of the liquid phase in the atmosphere, the convective molar and energy transfer, a liquid outflow condition as well as the precipitation and the radiation terms.

Different formulations have been studied for isothermal and non-isothermal compositional Darcy flows. They basically differ by their choice of the principal unknowns and equations and by the way they deal with phase transitions which is one of the main difficulty of this type of models. The objective of such a choice is usually to reduce the nonlinearity of the successive nonlinear systems that typically arise when solving a transient problem with an Euler fully implicit time integration scheme.

Let us distinguish between variable switch and persistent variable formulations. The first ones adapt the set of principal unknowns and equations to the set of present phases which can vary in space and time. The most well known formulation in this family is the so called natural variable or Coats' formulation

widely used in reservoir simulations [14, 13, 19, 41]. It has the advantage to use the physical variables of the thermodynamic and hydrodynamic laws as the set of principal unknowns. Its main drawback is to require a cumbersome switch of this set of variables depending on the set of present phases at each point of the space time domain. On the other hand, persistent variable formulations are based either on natural physical quantities such as overall component molar fractions or total specific enthalpy (see [40]), or alternatively on nonstandard principal variables such as in [8, 26]. Another strategy to avoid the switch of variables is based on the extension of some physical quantities such as the phase molar fractions like in [22] using component fugacities, or the phase molar fractions and pressures like in [3, 27]. Let us also mention the negative saturation formulations [1, 36] belonging to this family. A comparison between some of these formulations can be found in [40, 27] in the case of isothermal compositional Darcy flows.

Our choice of the formulation is based, like in the Coats' formulation, on the pressures, saturations, temperature and phase molar fractions as set of principal variables. This is a convenient choice since all the physical laws can be directly expressed using subsets of this set of variables. It is also a very natural choice in single phase regions which are usually dominant in geothermal applications. In order to avoid the switch of variables, this choice of the principal variables is combined with an extension of the phase molar fractions of an absent phase by the molar fractions at thermodynamic equilibrium with the present phase. It results that the set of principal variables does not depend on the set of present phases. Moreover, the phase transitions can be expressed as complementary constraints as in [22] which means that the nonlinear systems can be solved using semi-smoothed Newton techniques such as the Newton-min algorithm [21, 5]. This formulation has been preferred to the formulation proposed in [22] since the use of the component fugacities as principal unknowns rather than the phase molar fractions results in additional nonlinear couplings between the molar fractions and the temperature which are not desirable for non-isothermal Darcy flows. In this work, the efficiency of this formulation combined with different improvements of the Newton-min nonlinear solver will be investigated on several test cases.

As mentioned in [34, 31], the interaction between the flow in the porous medium and the atmosphere plays an important role in geothermal flows. Since the coupling between the porous medium and surface flows is not computationally realistic at the space and time scales of a geothermal flow, our objective is rather to model the soil-atmosphere interaction using an advanced boundary condition accounting for the matter (mole) and energy balance at the interface between the porous medium and the atmosphere. Such model should take into account the vaporization of the liquid phase, the convective molar and energy transfer, a liquid outflow condition at seepage surfaces, as well as the heat radiation and the precipitation influx.

Assuming the vaporization of the liquid phase at the soil-atmosphere interface, the molar and energy normal fluxes at the interface on the atmosphere side are frequently approximated in hydrogeology by two-point fluxes between the gas phase at the interface and the atmosphere at a reference height [15, 12]. The transmissivities of these two-point fluxes are based on convective molar and energy transfer coefficients. Such approximation basically assumes that the lateral variations in wind, air temperature and humidity can be neglected [39]. Let us refer to the textbook [29] on meteorology for the computation of convective molar and energy transfer coefficients at the soil-atmosphere interface depending on the roughness of the soil surface including the effect of the vegetation, on the wind velocity, on the eddy diffusivity in the air stream and stability of the air above the heated soil surface. The radiation which is absorbed by and emitted from the soil surface as well as the precipitation recharge can also be incorporated in such models [15, 12].

Outflow boundary conditions are frequently used in hydrogeology at seepage surfaces allowing the groundwater discharge to occur where the water table intercepts a sloping land surface. They have already been used for geothermal applications as in [20] for a single component liquid gas Darcy flow model. For the Richards equation, outflow boundary conditions are modelled by complementary constraints between the non negative liquid normal flux and the non positive capillary pressure (see [38]). For liquid gas Darcy flow models, they are combined with a Dirichlet boundary condition for the gas pressure [23].

To our knowledge, their extension to general non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flows has not yet been derived.

In this work, both the evaporation and liquid outflow models are combined in a single boundary condition which automatically switches from evaporation to evaporation and liquid outflow boundary condition. It assumes that the liquid phase does not accumulate at the surface on the atmosphere side - considering that standing water condition such as lake or sea can easily be expressed in the form of Dirichlet conditions. Alternatively, one would need to model the flow of the liquid phase at the soil-atmosphere surface which has not been considered here and might induce a coupling with a system with different time scales than the underlying geothermal system. Our boundary condition is coupled with the general non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow model. The previous formulation of the Darcy flow model is adapted to account for the new unknowns and equations at the soil-atmosphere interface. The derivation of the two-point molar and energy fluxes in the atmosphere is obtained starting from the transmission conditions proposed in [30] (see also [28, 39]) for the coupling of non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy and free gas flows. The complementary constraints for the liquid outflow are extended to non-isothermal compositional flows using a switching criteria based on the thermodynamic equilibrium between the gas and liquid phases at the interface on the free-flow side.

The structure of the rest of this article is as follows. The non-isothermal compositional two-phase Darcy flow model and its formulation are presented in section 2. The soil-atmosphere boundary condition is derived in section 3. Then, the finite volume two-point flux discretization of the model as well as the Newton-min algorithms used to solve the fully coupled systems at each time step of the simulation are introduced in section 4. In section 5, the soil-atmosphere evaporation boundary condition is compared with a full-dimensional free gas flow and transport model coupled to the liquid gas Darcy flow. In section 6, the model and its formulation are studied numerically in terms of solution and convergence of the Newton-min nonlinear solvers on several geothermal test cases including 1D test cases and 2D cuts of the Bouillante geothermal field in Guadeloupe.

2 Non-isothermal compositional two-phase Darcy flow model

We consider a non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow model with $\mathcal{P} = \{g, l\}$ denoting the set of gas and liquid phases. Each phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ is a mixture of a set of components denoted by \mathcal{C} including typically a water component, denoted w , which can vaporize in the gas phase and a set of gaseous components which can dissolve in the liquid phase. The thermodynamic properties of each phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ depend on its pressure P^α , the local equilibrium temperature of the system T and its molar fractions $C^\alpha = (C_i^\alpha)_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$.

For each phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$, we denote by $\zeta^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha)$ its molar density, by $\rho^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha)$ its mass density, by $\mu^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha)$ its dynamic viscosity, by $e^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha)$ its molar internal energy and by $h^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha)$ its molar enthalpy. For the gas phase, assuming an ideal mixture, the molar enthalpy is defined by

$$h^g(P^g, T, C^g) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^g h_i^g(P^g, T), \quad (2.1)$$

where $h_i^g(P^g, T)$ is the molar enthalpy of the component i in the gas phase. Thermodynamic equilibrium between the gas and liquid phases is assumed for each component and governed by the phase fugacities denoted by $f_i^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha) = (f_i^\alpha(P^\alpha, T, C^\alpha))_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$.

The rock porosity is denoted by $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ and the rock permeability tensor by $\mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ where \mathbf{x} denotes the spatial coordinates. The hydrodynamic Darcy laws are characterized by the relative permeability $k_r^\alpha(\mathbf{x}, S^\alpha)$ of each phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$, as a function of the phase saturation S^α , and by the capillary pressure $P_c(\mathbf{x}, S^g) = P^g - P^l$. The dependence of the relative permeabilities and capillary pressure on \mathbf{x} , which is piecewise constant for each rocktype, is omitted in the following for the sake of simplicity.

Our formulation of the model is based on the fixed set of unknowns defined by

$$X = (P^\alpha, T, S^\alpha, C^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{P}). \quad (2.2)$$

Note that, as opposed to the Coats' variable switch formulation [14, 13, 19, 41], the molar fractions C^α of an absent phase α are extended by the ones at equilibrium with the present phase in the sense that the equality of the gas and liquid fugacities $f^g(P^g, T, C^g) = f^l(P^l, T, C^l)$ always holds.

Let $n_i(X)$ be the number of moles of the component $i \in \mathcal{C}$ per unit pore volume defined by

$$n_i(X) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} \zeta^\alpha S^\alpha C_i^\alpha, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}.$$

We introduce the rock energy per unit rock volume defined by $E_r(T)$ and the fluid energy per unit pore volume defined by

$$E(X) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} \zeta^\alpha S^\alpha e^\alpha.$$

Let us denote by \mathbf{g} the gravitational acceleration vector. The generalized Darcy velocity of the phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{V}^\alpha = -\frac{k_r^\alpha}{\mu^\alpha} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) (\nabla P^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \mathbf{g}). \quad (2.3)$$

The total molar flux of the component $i \in \mathcal{C}$ is denoted by \mathbf{q}_i and the energy flux by \mathbf{q}_e , with

$$\mathbf{q}_i = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} C_i^\alpha \zeta^\alpha \mathbf{V}^\alpha, \quad \mathbf{q}_e = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} h^\alpha \zeta^\alpha \mathbf{V}^\alpha - \lambda \nabla T, \quad (2.4)$$

where λ stands for the bulk thermal conductivity of the fluid and rock mixture.

The system of equations accounts for the molar conservation of each component $i \in \mathcal{C}$ together with the energy conservation

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \partial_t n_i + \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{q}_i) &= 0, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \phi(\mathbf{x}) \partial_t E + (1 - \phi(\mathbf{x})) \partial_t E_r + \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{q}_e) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

It is complemented by the following capillary relation between the two phase pressures and the pore volume balance

$$\begin{cases} P_c(S^g) = P^g - P^l, \\ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} S^\alpha = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

In the spirit of [22, 27], the liquid gas thermodynamic equilibrium can be expressed as the following complementary constraints for each phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ combined with the equality of the gas and liquid fugacities of each component:

$$\begin{cases} S^\alpha \geq 0, 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^\alpha \geq 0, S^\alpha (1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^\alpha) = 0, & \alpha \in \mathcal{P}, \\ f_i^g(P^g, T, C^g) = f_i^l(P^l, T, C^l), & i \in \mathcal{C}. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Note that our formulation of the model leads, independently on the set of present phases, to the fix sets of $2\#\mathcal{C} + 5$ unknowns (2.2) and of $2\#\mathcal{C} + 5$ equations (2.5)-(2.6)-(2.7) including the $\#\mathcal{C} + 1$ conservation equations (2.5) and the remaining $\#\mathcal{C} + 4$ local closure laws (2.6)-(2.7). It has also the advantage to express the thermodynamic equilibrium as complementary constraints which will allow the use of semi-smooth Newton methods [21, 5] to solve the nonlinear systems at each time step of the simulation as specified in section 4.1.

3 Soil-atmosphere boundary condition for non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow

The fluid and energy transport in high energy geothermal systems is deeply governed by the conditions set at the boundary of the computational domain. In particular, it is well known that the modelling of the interaction between the porous medium model and the atmosphere plays an important role [34, 31]. In this section, a boundary condition is derived to model the soil-atmosphere interaction based on mole and energy balance equations set at the interface. The model takes into account two coupling processes: on the one hand, the vaporization of the liquid phase and the convective molar and energy transfer in the atmosphere described in subsection 3.1, on the other hand, a liquid outflow condition described in subsection 3.2. Both coupling processes will be combined in a single boundary condition assuming that the liquid phase does not accumulate at the surface. The radiation and the precipitation recharge are also considered.

3.1 Convective molar and energy transfer in the atmosphere

3.1.1 Transmission conditions at the interface between a non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow and a gas free flow

The derivation of the boundary condition accounting for convective molar and energy transfer in the atmosphere can be explained starting from the transmission conditions introduced in [30] (see also [28, 39]) to couple a non-isothermal compositional liquid gas Darcy flow with a gas free flow. These conditions state the continuity of the component molar and energy normal fluxes, assuming instantaneous vaporization of the liquid phase, as well as the continuity of the gas molar fractions, of the temperature and of the gas pressure, neglecting the gas pressure jump. It is complemented by the thermodynamic equilibrium between the liquid and gas phases and by the Beavers-Joseph condition. On the free-flow side, the component molar and energy fluxes are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_i &= \zeta^g(P, T, C) \left(C_i \mathbf{u} - D_t \nabla C_i \right), i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \mathbf{w}_e &= \zeta^g(P, T, C) h^g(P, T, C) \mathbf{u} - \lambda_t \nabla T - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \zeta^g(P, T, C) h_i^g(P, T) D_t \nabla C_i, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathbf{u} denotes the gas velocity, P the pressure, $C = (C_i)_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ the gas molar fractions, T the temperature, D_t the turbulent diffusivity and λ_t the turbulent thermal conductivity. The continuity of the component molar normal fluxes states that

$$\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{q}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}, i \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (3.2)$$

where the unit normal vector \mathbf{n} at the interface is oriented outward from the porous medium domain. The last term in the free-flow energy flux in (3.1) introduces a strong nonlinear coupling between the component molar and energy fluxes which raises an additional difficulty in the two-point approximation of the normal fluxes. This can be addressed in a simple and efficient way if the dissolution of the gaseous components in the liquid phase is small which corresponds to the usual case. In such a case, using $\zeta^g \ll \zeta^l$, $C_w \ll 1$, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i = 1$ and (3.2), we can derive that

$$|\mathbf{q}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}| \ll |\mathbf{q}_w \cdot \mathbf{n}| \sim \zeta^g |\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n}| \sim \zeta^g D_t |\nabla C_w \cdot \mathbf{n}|, \quad (3.3)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{w\}$. Using that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i = 1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{w}_e + \lambda_t \nabla T) \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \zeta^g(P, T, C) \left(h^g(P, T, C) \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} h_i^g(P, T) D_t \nabla C_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \\ &= \zeta^g(P, T, C) \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} h_i^g(P, T) C_i \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{w\}} (h_i^g(P, T) - h_w^g(P, T)) D_t \nabla C_i \cdot \mathbf{n} \right) \\ &= h_w^g(P, T) \zeta^g(P, T, C) \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{w\}} (h_i^g(P, T) - h_w^g(P, T)) \mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

From (3.3) and (3.2), it results that

$$(\mathbf{w}_e + \lambda_t \nabla T) \cdot \mathbf{n} \sim h_w^g(P, T) \zeta^g(P, T, C) \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n},$$

allowing to use the following approximation of $\mathbf{w}_e \cdot \mathbf{n}$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_e \cdot \mathbf{n} = h_w^g(P, T) \zeta^g(P, T, C) \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \lambda_t \nabla T \cdot \mathbf{n}. \quad (3.5)$$

3.1.2 Two-point flux approximation

The boundary conditions are obtained by two-point flux approximations of the component normal fluxes $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{n}$, $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and of the energy normal flux $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_e \cdot \mathbf{n}$. These two-point fluxes are computed between the interface on the atmosphere side and the far field atmospheric conditions at a given reference height. The far field atmospheric conditions are defined by the constant gas molar fractions $C_\infty^{g,atm}$, temperature T_∞^{atm} and pressure P^{atm} , which fixes the far field atmospheric specific gas enthalpy of the water component $h_{w,\infty}^{g,atm} = h_w^g(P^{atm}, T_\infty^{atm})$. From the transmission conditions stated above, the temperature, the gas molar fractions and the gas pressure defined at the interface on the atmospheric side, match with their values on the porous-medium side and consequently they are denoted respectively by T , C^g and P^g . The two-point flux approximations account for the turbulent boundary layers of the gas flow and transport in the atmosphere using the molar and energy transfer coefficients H_m and H_T . These coefficients are usually obtained from correlations used for environmental gas flows depending on the roughness of the soil surface including the effect of the vegetation, on the wind velocity, on the eddy diffusivity in the air stream and stability of the air above the heated soil surface [29]. The two-point fluxes also take into account the convective normal fluxes using, as additional unknown, the gas molar flow rate $q_e^{g,atm}$ at the interface on the atmosphere side oriented outward from the porous-medium domain. It is combined with an upwinding of the gas molar fractions and of the gas enthalpy of the water component between the interface and the far field atmospheric conditions. This leads us to define the following two-point fluxes oriented outward from the porous-medium domain:

$$\begin{aligned} q_i^{g,atm} &= (q_e^{g,atm})^+ C_i^g - (q_e^{g,atm})^- C_{i,\infty}^{g,atm} + H_m (C_i^g - C_{i,\infty}^{g,atm}), \quad i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ q_e^{g,atm} &= (q_e^{g,atm})^+ h_w^g(P^g, T) - (q_e^{g,atm})^- h_{w,\infty}^{g,atm} + H_T (T - T_\infty^{atm}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where for any real u , we have set $(u)^+ = \max(0, u)$ and $(u)^- = \max(0, -u)$.

Neglecting the variations of pressure in the atmosphere, leads to the following continuity equation for the gas pressure

$$P^g = P^{atm}. \quad (3.7)$$

Thermodynamic equilibrium is always assumed at the interface in the sense that the gas molar fractions and pressure at the interface on the porous-medium side are extended by the one at equilibrium with the liquid phase in the absence of the gas phase. On the other hand, the liquid phase can appear or disappear according to the liquid phase complementary constraints. It results that the following equations hold at the interface:

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^g(P^g, T, C^g) &= f_i^l(P^l, T, C^l), \quad i \in \mathcal{C} \\ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^g &= 1, \\ S^l &\geq 0, 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^l \geq 0, S^l(1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^l) = 0, \\ S^g &= S^g(P^g - P^l), \\ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} S^\alpha &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where P^l is the liquid pressure, C^l the liquid molar fractions and S^α , $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$ the saturations at the interface on the porous medium side and $S^g(P_c)$ denotes the inverse of the monotone graph extension of the capillary pressure function $P_c(S^g)$. As detailed in [9, 10] and in subsection 6.1.2, a switch of variables between S^g and P_c could also be used in order to account for non invertible capillary functions.

Regarding the interface energy balance, the model can also account for the solar and long wave radiation that is absorbed by and emitted from the soil surface defined by the following net radiation R_n ($\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$):

$$R_n = (1 - a)R_s + R_a - \varepsilon \sigma_{SB} T^4, \quad (3.9)$$

where R_a is the incoming long-wave radiation emitted by the atmosphere, R_s ($\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$) is the net short-wave radiation, a is the surface albedo, σ_{SB} ($\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{K}^{-4}$) is the Stephan-Boltzman constant and ε the soil emissivity.

3.2 Liquid outflow complementary constraints

The liquid phase is assumed to vaporize instantaneously when leaving the porous medium as long as the atmosphere is not saturated with water vapour. As soon as the atmosphere is vapour saturated at the interface, the component molar and energy normal fluxes in the liquid phase defined by

$$\begin{aligned} q_i^{l,atm} &= C_i^{l,atm} q^{l,atm}, i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ q_e^{l,atm} &= h^l(P^l, T, C^{l,atm}) q^{l,atm}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

are allowed to exit the porous medium, where $q^{l,atm} \geq 0$ is an additional unknown corresponding to the total liquid molar flow rate oriented positively outward to the porous-medium domain. In (3.10), the liquid molar fractions $C^{l,atm} = (C_i^{l,atm})_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$ at the interface on the atmosphere side are those at thermodynamic equilibrium with the gas phase, and are such that

$$f^l(P^{atm}, T, C^{l,atm}) = f^g(P^g, T, C^g). \quad (3.11)$$

Note that, due to the jump of the capillary pressure which vanishes on the atmosphere side, $C^{l,atm}$ does not match in general with the liquid molar fractions on the porous-medium side C^l which satisfies

$$f^l(P^l, T, C^l) = f^g(P^g, T, C^g). \quad (3.12)$$

The liquid molar outflow rate $q^{l,atm}$ is determined by the following complementary constraints accounting for the thermodynamic equilibrium between the liquid and gas phases at the interface on the atmosphere side:

$$\begin{cases} (1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^{l,atm}) q^{l,atm} = 0, \\ 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^{l,atm} \geq 0, \quad q^{l,atm} \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

It remains to eliminate the liquid molar fractions $C^{l,atm}$ from (3.10) and (3.13). Let us consider for $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ the function $\mathcal{C}^l(f, P^l, T) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{C}}$ defined as the unique solution of the equation $f^l(P^l, T, C^l) = f$. From $f^g(P^g, T, C^g) = f^l(P^g, T, C^{l,atm}) = f^l(P^l, T, C^l) := \bar{f}$ given by the equations (3.11) and (3.12), it results that

$$C^{l,atm} = \mathcal{C}^l(\bar{f}, P^g, T).$$

On the one hand, if $S^l > 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^{l,atm} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (C_i^l - C_i^{l,atm}) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (\mathcal{C}_i^l(\bar{f}, P^l, T) - \mathcal{C}_i^l(\bar{f}, P^g, T)). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Following [27], since the function $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{C}_i^l(f, P, T)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to P , it results that the complementary constraints (3.13) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} (P^g - P^l) q^{l,atm} = 0, \\ P^g - P^l \geq 0, \quad q^{l,atm} \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

On the other hand, if $S^l = 0$ then one has $P^g - P^l = P_c(1) > 0$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^{l,atm} < 1$. It results that both conditions (3.15) and (3.13) imply that $q^{l,atm} = 0$. Finally, let us remark that if (3.15) holds, the liquid outflow fluxes in (3.10) rewrite as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} q_i^{l,atm} &= C_i^l q^{l,atm}, i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ q_e^{l,atm} &= h^l(P^l, T, C^l) q^{l,atm}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

The model also takes into account the following component molar and energy flow rates which represent the precipitation recharge

$$\begin{aligned} q_i^{l,rain} &= C_i^{l,rain} q^{l,rain}, i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ q_e^{l,rain} &= h^l(P^{atm}, T_\infty^{atm}, C^{l,rain}) q^{l,rain}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

with the rain molar fractions denoted by $C^{l,rain} = (C_i^{l,rain})_{i \in \mathcal{C}}$, a temperature assumed at equilibrium with the far field atmosphere and the rain molar enthalpy denoted by $h^{l,rain} = h^l(P^{atm}, T_\infty^{atm}, C^{l,rain})$.

3.3 Evaporation-outflow boundary condition

Both the liquid outflow and evaporation models are combined in a single boundary condition, assuming that the liquid does not accumulate at the surface. Gathering the equations (3.6), (3.7), (3.8), (3.15), (3.16), (3.17) together with the component molar and energy balance equations, the evaporation-outflow boundary condition at the interface is defined by the sets of $7 + 2\#\mathcal{C}$ unknowns

$$X_\Gamma = \left(q^{g,atm}, q^{l,atm}, T, P^\alpha, S^\alpha, C^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{P} \right),$$

and equations

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{q}_i \cdot \mathbf{n} = (q^{g,atm})^+ C_i^g - (q^{g,atm})^- C_{i,\infty}^{g,atm} + H_m (C_i^g - C_{i,\infty}^{g,atm}) \\ \quad + C_i^l q^{l,atm} + C_i^{l,rain} q^{l,rain}, i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \mathbf{q}_e \cdot \mathbf{n} = (q^{g,atm})^+ h_w^g(P^g, T) - (q^{g,atm})^- h_{w,\infty}^{g,atm} + H_T (T - T_\infty^{atm}) \\ \quad - R_n + h^l(P^l, T, C^l) q^{l,atm} + h^{l,rain} q^{l,rain}, \\ P^g = P^{atm}, \\ S^g = \mathcal{S}^g(P^g - P^l), \\ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} S^\alpha = 1, \\ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^g = 1, \\ S^l \geq 0, 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^l \geq 0, S^l (1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^l) = 0, \\ f_i^g(P^g, T, C^g) = f_i^l(P^l, T, C^l), i \in \mathcal{C} \\ P^g - P^l \geq 0, q^{l,atm} \geq 0, (P^g - P^l) q^{l,atm} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

4 Discretization and nonlinear solvers

The system of equations (2.5)-(2.6)-(2.7)-(3.18) is discretized using a finite volume discretization in space with a Two-Point Flux Approximation (TPFA) of the Darcy and Fourier fluxes [18, 17] combined with a phase based upwind scheme for the approximation of the mobilities [4, 18]. A mesh satisfying the admissibility condition of TPFA schemes at both inner and boundary faces is used [18, 17]. It can be typically a triangular mesh with acute angles with isotropic permeability, a Voronoi mesh with isotropic permeability or a Cartesian mesh with anisotropic permeability aligned with the axes. In all cases the permeability is assumed cellwise constant.

Let Ω denote a bounded polytopal domain of \mathbb{R}^d (polygonal for $d = 2$ or polyhedral for $d = 3$) and $\Gamma \subset \partial\Omega$ the boundary on which the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition is imposed. Let us denote by \mathcal{M} the set of cells that are disjoint open polytopal subsets of Ω such that $\bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{M}} \bar{K} = \bar{\Omega}$. It is assumed that there exists a subset \mathcal{F}_Γ of the set of faces such that

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_\Gamma} \bar{\sigma}.$$

For the sake of simplicity only the boundary faces $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$ are considered in the following. The time integration is based on a fully implicit Euler scheme to avoid severe restrictions on the time steps. For $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$, let us consider the time discretization $t^0 = 0 < t^1 < \dots < t^{n-1} < t^n \dots < t^N = t_f$ of the time interval $[0, t_f]$. We denote the time steps by $\Delta t^n = t^n - t^{n-1}$ for all $n = 1, \dots, N$.

Let us denote the set of physical unknowns by

$$X_K = \left(P_K^\alpha, T_K, S_K^\alpha, C_K^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{P} \right), \quad (4.1)$$

for each cell $K \in \mathcal{M}$ and by

$$X_\sigma = \left(q_\sigma^{g,atm}, q_\sigma^{l,atm}, P_\sigma^\alpha, T_\sigma, S_\sigma^\alpha, C_\sigma^\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{P} \right), \quad (4.2)$$

for each boundary face $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$. The full set of unknowns is denoted by

$$X_{\mathcal{Q}} = \{X_K, X_\sigma, K \in \mathcal{M}, \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_\Gamma\}. \quad (4.3)$$

For each degree of freedom $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$, we denote by $R_v(X_{\mathcal{Q}})$ the residual vector ($R_{v,i}(X_{\mathcal{Q}})$, $i \in \mathcal{C} \cup \{e\}$) of the component and energy conservation equations and by $\mathcal{L}_v(X_v)$ the residual vector of the local closure laws. It defines the following nonlinear system at each time step $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathcal{R}(X_{\mathcal{Q}}) = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} R_K(X_{\mathcal{Q}}) \\ \mathcal{L}_K(X_K) \end{pmatrix} & K \in \mathcal{M}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} R_\sigma(X_{\mathcal{Q}}) \\ \mathcal{L}_\sigma(X_\sigma) \end{pmatrix} & \sigma \in \mathcal{F}_\Gamma, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where the current time step superscript n has been dropped.

4.1 Newton-min nonlinear solver

The nonlinear system $\mathcal{R}(X_{\mathcal{Q}}) = 0$ is solved using a Newton-min solver [21, 5] as detailed below. In order to reduce the size of the linear systems to be solved at each Newton-min iteration to $\#\mathcal{C} + 1$ equations and unknowns for each degree of freedom $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$, the set of unknowns X_v is splitted into $\#\mathcal{C} + 1$ primary unknowns X_v^p and the remaining secondary unknowns X_v^s . This splitting is done for each degree of freedom in such a way that the Jacobian of the local closure laws $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_v}{\partial X_v^s}(X_v)$ with respect to the secondary unknowns is non singular.

The Newton-min algorithm is initialized with an initial guess $X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)}$ usually given by the previous time step solution and iterates on the following steps for $r = 0, \dots$, until the stopping criteria

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{C} \cup \{e\}} \left(\frac{\sum_{v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T} |R_{v,i}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(r)})|}{\sum_{v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T} |R_{v,i}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(0)})|} \right) \leq \varepsilon_R \quad \text{or} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\#\mathcal{C}+1} \left(\frac{\max_{v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T} |dX_{v,i}^p(r)|}{\Delta X_i} \right) \leq \varepsilon_X$$

for $\varepsilon_R = 10^{-8}$, $\varepsilon_X = 10^{-6}$, given $\Delta X_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, \#\mathcal{C} + 1$, and with the Newton's step $dX_{v,i}^p(r)$ defined in (4.5). If the convergence is not met after r_{\max} Newton iterations, the time step is chopped.

1. Computation of the residual $\mathcal{R}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(r)})$ and of the Jacobian matrix with elimination of the secondary unknowns. It starts with the choice of the primary and secondary unknowns for each degree of freedom $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T$ depending only on the active complementary constraints as specified in Table (4.1). Then the matrices $A_v^{sp(r)}$ and the vectors $B_v^s(r)$, $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T$ defined by

$$A_v^{sp(r)} = - \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_v}{\partial X_v^s(r)} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_v}{\partial X_v^p(r)}, \quad B_v^s(r) = \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_v}{\partial X_v^s(r)} \right)^{-1} \mathcal{L}_v$$

and such that

$$dX_v^s(r) = A_v^{sp(r)} dX_v^p(r) + B_v^s(r),$$

are computed to obtain the reduced Jacobian $J^{(r)} = (J_{v,v'}^{(r)})_{(v,v') \in (\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T)^2}$ defined by the square matrices of size $\#\mathcal{C} + 1$

$$J_{v,v'}^{(r)} = \frac{\partial R_v}{\partial X_{v'}^p(r)}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(r)}) + \frac{\partial R_v}{\partial X_{v'}^s(r)}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(r)}) A_{v'}^{sp(r)},$$

and the reduced right hand side $B^{(r)} = (B_v^{(r)})_{v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T}$ defined by the vectors of size $\#\mathcal{C} + 1$

$$B_v^{(r)} = -R_v(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(r)}) - \sum_{v' \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{\partial R_v}{\partial X_{v'}^s(r)}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^{(r)}) B_{v'}^s(r).$$

2. Computation of the solution of the reduced linear system

$$J^{(r)} dX_{\mathcal{D}}^p(r) = B^{(r)}. \quad (4.5)$$

3. Update of the unknowns $X_v^{(r)}$ $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_T$ with a possible relaxation $\theta^{(r)} \in (0, 1]$

$$\begin{cases} X_v^{p(r+1)} = X_v^p(r) + \theta^{(r)} dX_v^p(r), \\ X_v^{s(r+1)} = X_v^s(r) + \theta^{(r)} (A_v^{sp(r)} dX_v^p(r) + B_v^s(r)). \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

4. Additional updates of some unknowns in order to satisfy exactly some nonlinear closure laws to be specified in the following paragraphs.

The step (4) of the above algorithm allows to propose different improvements of the basic Newton-min algorithm that are detailed in the following paragraphs.

Table 4.1 Primary unknowns of the degree of freedom v depending on the active complementary constraints of the Newton-min algorithm.

$v \in \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$		$v \in \mathcal{M}$	
$q_v^{l,atm}$ $1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^l$	$q_v^{g,atm}, P_{c,v}, (C_{i,v}^l)_{i=1, \# \mathcal{C}-1}$	$1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^g$ $1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^l$	$P_v^g, S_v^g, (C_{i,v}^l)_{i=1, \# \mathcal{C}-1}$
$P_v^g - P_v^l$ $1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^l$	$q_v^{g,atm}, q_v^{l,atm}, T_v,$ $(C_{i,v}^l)_{i=1, \# \mathcal{C}-2}$	S_v^g $1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^l$	$P_v^g, T_v, (C_{i,v}^l)_{i=1, \# \mathcal{C}-1}$
$q_v^{l,atm}$ S_v^l	$q_v^{g,atm}, T_v, (C_{i,v}^g)_{i=1, \# \mathcal{C}-1}$	$1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^g$ S_v^l	$P_v^g, T_v, (C_{i,v}^g)_{i=1, \# \mathcal{C}-1}$

4.1.1 Basic Newton-min algorithm

The basic version of the Newton-min algorithm only enforces at each iterate the following nonlinear closure law for $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$:

$$P_v^g - P_v^l = P_c(S_v^g).$$

Our objective for this basic Newton-min algorithm was to use no projections of the physical unknowns onto their physical bounds. However, in order to obtain the convergence of the Newton-min algorithm, it was necessary to project the molar fractions of a present phase within the range say $[-0.2; 1.2]$ at each Newton iterate.

4.1.2 Newton-min with projection on the complementary constraints

In order to obtain a better convergence of the Newton-min algorithm, all the complementary constraints of type $\min(X_1, X_2) = 0$ are enforced at the initial guess and at each Newton iterate. In addition, $P_v^g - P_v^l = P_c(S_v^g)$ is also enforced at each Newton iterate and the following physical ranges are imposed on the molar fractions of a present phase and on the saturations:

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } S_v^\alpha > 0 \text{ then } 0 \leq C_{i,v}^\alpha \leq 1, & i \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{P}, \\ S_v^\alpha \geq 0, & \alpha \in \mathcal{P}, \\ \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} S_v^\alpha = 1. \end{cases}$$

An additional improvement also studied in the numerical section is to test the appearance of a missing phase using the molar fractions at equilibrium with the present phase rather than their linear Newton updates.

4.1.3 Newton-min with projection on the complementary constraints and thermodynamic equilibrium

In addition to the previous updates, the molar fractions $C^{\bar{\alpha}}$ which are secondary unknowns (see Table 4.1), complemented by the temperature if both phases are present, are updated in order to verify the following closure laws at each Newton iterate:

$$\begin{cases} \min\left(S_v^{\bar{\alpha}}, 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_{i,v}^{\bar{\alpha}}\right) = 0, \\ f_i^g(P_v^g, T_v, C_v^g) = f_i^l(P_v^l, T_v, C_v^l), & i \in \mathcal{C} \end{cases}$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{F}_\Gamma$. Note that the first equation is already satisfied if only one phase is present as $S_v^{\bar{\alpha}} = 0$.

5 Validation of the soil-atmosphere evaporation boundary condition

In this subsection, the solutions of the non-isothermal liquid gas Darcy flow coupled either with the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition or with a full-dimensional gas free flow, are compared. The full-dimensional free-flow model is a non-isothermal compositional Reynolds Average Navier-Stokes (RANS) gas flow. The coupling conditions at the interface between the free-flow and porous-medium domains are those introduced in [30]. They assume the vaporization of the liquid phase in the free-flow domain and account for the gas molar fraction and molar and energy normal flux continuity, the liquid gas thermodynamic equilibrium, the no slip condition and the normal component of the normal stress continuity.

We consider a 2D test case from [7] which simulates the mass and energy exchanges occurring within deep geological radioactive waste disposal at the interface between a geological formation with low permeable porous medium and a ventilation excavated gallery. The data set is derived from lab experiments and in accordance with the deep disposal center for French radioactive waste project. In this test case, the porous medium initially saturated with the liquid phase is dried by suction in the neighbourhood of the interface between the porous and free-flow domains. The gas phase penetrates the porous domain and the liquid phase is vaporized in the free-flow domain.

As exhibited in Figure 5.1, the porous-medium domain is defined by $\Omega_{pm} = (0, l) \times (h_{ff}, h_{pm})$ with $l = 100$ m, $h_{ff} = 5$ m, $h_{pm} = 20$ m. It corresponds to the computational domain of the Darcy flow model coupled with the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition at the interface $\Gamma = (0, l) \times \{h_{ff}\}$. The computational domain $(0, l) \times (0, h_{pm})$ of the coupled Darcy and full-dimensional free-flow models is the union of the porous medium domain Ω_{pm} and of the free-flow domain $\Omega_{ff} = (0, l) \times (0, h_{ff})$.




Fig. 5.1 Computational domain of the coupled Darcy and full-dimensional free-flow models.




Fig. 5.2 Computational domain of the Darcy flow model coupled with the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition.

A single rocktype defined by the Callovo Oxfordian clay (Cox) is considered in the porous medium with the homogeneous porosity $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = 0.15$ and isotropic permeability $\mathbf{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = K \times I$ with $K = 5 \cdot 10^{-20}$

m². The relative permeabilities and capillary pressure are given by the following Van Genuchten laws with the parameters $n = 1.49$, $m = 1 - \frac{1}{n}$, $Pr = 15 \cdot 10^6$ Pa and the residual liquid and gas saturations $S_r^l = 0.4$, $S_r^g = 0$ (see Figure 5.3).

$$k_r^l(S^l) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } S^l < S_r^l, \\ 1 & \text{if } S^l > 1 - S_r^g, \\ \sqrt{\bar{S}^l} \left(1 - (1 - (\bar{S}^l)^{\frac{1}{m}})^m \right)^2 & \text{if } S_r^l \leq S^l \leq 1 - S_r^g, \end{cases}$$

$$k_r^g(S^g) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } S^g < S_r^g, \\ 1 & \text{if } S^g > 1 - S_r^l, \\ \sqrt{1 - \bar{S}^l} \left(1 - (\bar{S}^l)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right)^{2m} & \text{if } S_r^g \leq S^g \leq 1 - S_r^l, \end{cases}$$

$$P_c(S^l) = Pr((\bar{S}^l)^{-\frac{1}{m}} - 1)^{\frac{1}{n}} \text{ if } 0 < \bar{S}^l \leq 1,$$

with

$$\bar{S}^l = \frac{S^l - S_r^l}{1 - S_r^l - S_r^g}.$$




Fig. 5.3 Relative permeabilities (left) of both phases k_r^α , $\alpha = g, l$ and capillary pressure P_c (right) as functions of the liquid saturation S^l of the Callovo Oxfordian clay.

The liquid and gas phases are a mixture of two components, the water denoted by w and the air denoted by a . The gas molar density is defined by the perfect gas law $\zeta^g = \frac{P^g}{RT}$, with $R = 8.314 \text{ J} \cdot \text{K}^{-1} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ and the liquid molar density is fixed to $\zeta^l = 55555 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$. The phases viscosities are fixed to $\mu^g = 18.51 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ Pa} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ and $\mu^l = 10^{-3} \text{ Pa} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$. The gas fugacities are given by Daltons law for an ideal mixture of perfect gas $f_i^g = C_i^g P^g$, $i = a, w$. The fugacity of the air component in the liquid phase is given by Henry's law $f_a^l = C_a^l H_a(T)$ with the temperature dependent Henry constant $H_a(T) = Ha_1 + (Ha_2 - Ha_1) \frac{T - T_1}{T_2 - T_1}$ where $Ha_1 = 6 \cdot 10^9 \text{ Pa}$, $Ha_2 = 10^{10} \text{ Pa}$, $T_1 = 293 \text{ K}$ and $T_2 = 353 \text{ K}$. For the water component in the liquid phase, the fugacity is taken from [37]

$$f_w^l = C_w^l P_{sat}(T) \exp\left(-\frac{P_{sat}(T) - P^l}{\zeta^l RT}\right),$$

where $P_{sat}(T)$ is the vapour pressure of the pure water given by the Rankine formula

$$P_{sat}(T) = 1.013 \cdot 10^5 \exp\left(13.7 - \frac{5120}{T}\right).$$

The liquid molar enthalpy h^l and the gas molar enthalpy of the water component h_w^g are taken from [37]. The gas molar enthalpy of the air component is given by $h_a^g(T) = c_{p,a}^g m_a T$ where $c_{p,a}^g = 1000 \text{ J} \cdot \text{K}^{-1} \cdot \text{Kg}^{-1}$

is the specific heat capacity of pure air and $m_a = 29 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ Kg. mol}^{-1}$ is the air molar mass. The gas molar enthalpy is then defined by (2.1). The thermal conductivity is fixed to $\lambda = 10 \text{ W.m}^2.\text{K}^{-1}$ and the rock energy per unit volume is given by $E_r(T) = 2 \cdot 10^6 T$ in J.m^{-3} with T in K.

The initial and top boundary conditions in the porous medium are defined by a liquid phase $S^l = 1$ with pure water $C_w^l = 1$, $C_a^l = 0$, a temperature T_{pm}^0 fixed either to 303 or 333 K and an hydrostatic pressure with 38 atm at the top boundary. The lateral boundaries are considered to be thermally isolated (no Fourier flux) and impervious (no Darcy flux). The soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition at the interface Γ is set with no radiation nor precipitation recharge and the outflow liquid flux is vanishing during the overall simulation in the following test cases.

At the output boundary $\Gamma_{\text{out}} = \{l\} \times (0, h_{ff})$ of the free-flow domain, the pressure $P_{\text{out}} = 10^5 \text{ Pa}$ is the atmospheric pressure. The velocity at the input boundary $\Gamma_{\text{in}} = \{0\} \times (0, h_{ff})$ is defined by the uncoupled turbulent velocity profile

$$\mathbf{u}^0(y) = \begin{pmatrix} u^0(y) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

computed from the Prandtl algebraic turbulent model (see [28]), with an average velocity

$$u_{\text{in}} = \frac{1}{h_{\text{ff}}} \int_0^{h_{\text{ff}}} u^0(y) dy = 0.5 \text{ m.s}^{-1},$$

and such that $u^0(h_{ff}) = u^0(0) = 0$. The temperature at the input boundary Γ_{in} is fixed to $T_{\text{in}} = 303 \text{ K}$ and the input molar fractions to

$$C_{\text{in}} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{w,\text{in}} \\ 1 - C_{w,\text{in}} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with the relative humidity } \frac{P_{\text{out}} C_{w,\text{in}}}{P_{\text{sat}}(T_{\text{in}})} = 0.5.$$

An homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition for the velocity and homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions for the molar and energy transport are used at the boundary $(0, l) \times \{0\}$. The turbulent viscosity μ_t used in the free-flow domain to define the RANS stress tensor is given by the Prandtl algebraic turbulent model as in [28] and computed once and for all from the uncoupled solution in the free-flow model. The turbulent diffusivity

$$D_t = D^g + \frac{\mu_t - \mu^g}{\rho^g S_c} \quad (5.1)$$

is deduced using the gas Fickian diffusion $D^g = 2 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2.\text{s}^{-1}$ and the Schmidt number $S_c = 1$. The turbulent thermal conductivity is similarly defined by $\lambda_t = \lambda^g + c_{p,a}^g(\mu_t - \mu^g)$ with the gas thermal conductivity $\lambda^g = 0.026 \text{ W.m}^{-1}.\text{K}^{-1}$.

The simulation is run over the time interval $[0, t_f]$ with $t_f = 200$ years, using an adaptive time step starting with an initial time stepping of 1s and a maximum time step of 10 years. The Cartesian mesh is uniform in the x direction with $N_x = 100$ edges and refined exponentially in the vertical y direction on both sides of the interface Γ to account for the turbulent boundary layer and for the high gradient of the liquid pressure. More precisely, the porous-medium mesh is defined by the parameters

$$N_e > 0, \quad N_y > N_e, \quad r > 1, \quad \Delta y_r > 0,$$

such that $h_{ff} + \Delta y_r(r^{N_e} - 1) < h_{pm}$. Numbering the y -edges (y_i, y_{i+1}) , $i = 1, \dots, N_y + 1$ from bottom to top, we set

$$y_i = \begin{cases} h_{ff} + \Delta y_r(r^{i-1} - 1), & 1 \leq i \leq N_e + 1, \\ y_{N_e+1} + (i - N_e - 1) \frac{h_{pm} - y_{N_e+1}}{N_y - N_e}, & N_e + 2 \leq i \leq N_y + 1. \end{cases}$$

The numerical performances of the Darcy flow model coupled with the soil-atmosphere boundary condition are assessed on the following meshes

$$\begin{aligned}
N_y = 30 \text{ with } N_e = 10, \quad r = 1.58, \quad \Delta y_r = 1.43 \cdot 10^{-2}, \\
N_y = 60 \text{ with } N_e = 20, \quad r = 1.28, \quad \Delta y_r = 1.02 \cdot 10^{-2}, \\
N_y = 90 \text{ with } N_e = 30, \quad r = 1.19, \quad \Delta y_r = 8.40 \cdot 10^{-3},
\end{aligned}$$

and the solutions of the liquid gas Darcy flow coupled either with the soil-atmosphere boundary condition or with the full-dimensional gas free flow are compared using the finest mesh with $N_y = 90$.

The convective molar and energy transfer coefficients are computed from the following low frequency diagonal approximations of the Dirichlet to Neumann operators related to the uncoupled convection diffusion equations in the free-flow domains. Let us define the solutions c and T of the following linear convection diffusion equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta^g(P_{\text{out}}, T_{\text{in}}) \operatorname{div}(c \mathbf{u}^0 - D_t \nabla c) &= 0 \text{ on } \Omega_{ff}, \\
c &= 1 \text{ on } \Gamma, \\
c &= 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{in}}, \\
\nabla c \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{out}}, \\
\nabla c \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \text{ on } (0, l) \times \{0\},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div}\left(\zeta^g(P_{\text{out}}, T_{\text{in}}) \frac{\partial h_w^g}{\partial T}(P_{\text{out}}, T_{\text{in}}) T \mathbf{u}^0 - \lambda_t \nabla T\right) &= 0 \text{ on } \Omega_{ff}, \\
T &= 1 \text{ on } \Gamma, \\
T &= 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{in}}, \\
\nabla T \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{\text{out}}, \\
\nabla T \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \text{ on } (0, l) \times \{0\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Then, we set

$$H_m(x) = \zeta^g(P_{\text{out}}, T_{\text{in}}) D^g \nabla c \cdot \mathbf{n}_{ff}|_{\Gamma}, \quad H_T(x) = \lambda^g \nabla T \cdot \mathbf{n}_{ff}|_{\Gamma}, \tag{5.4}$$

with \mathbf{n}_{ff} the normal at Γ oriented outward to the free-flow domain.

$N_x \times N_y$	100×30	100×60	100×90
Basic Newton-min	×	×	×
Newton-min with projection	157/0/583/147	157/1/699/552	×
and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	157/0/540/147	157/0/596/502	157/0/615/1012
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	157/0/543/140	157/0/594/487	157/0/623/988

Table 5.1 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time for the three Newton-min methods obtained with $N_y = 30, 60, 90$ and $T_{pm}^0 = 303$ K.

Figures 5.4 and 5.5 show that the soil-atmosphere boundary condition combined with the convective molar and energy transfer coefficients (5.4) provides a very good approximation of the coupled non-isothermal liquid gas Darcy and full-dimensional gas free flow model. The mismatch is larger for $T_{pm}^0 = 333$ K than for $T_{pm}^0 = 303$ K on the evaporation rate due to larger variations in time of the convective molar and energy transfer coefficients not captured by H_m and H_T . On the over hand, the temperature and relative humidity at the interface remains very well approximated in both cases.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 compare, respectively for $T_{pm}^0 = 303$ K and $T_{pm}^0 = 333$ K and for the three meshes, the numerical efficiency of the Newton-min nonlinear solvers with their different improvements. It is




Fig. 5.4 Mean relative humidity, mean temperature (in K) and molar flow rate of the water component (in $\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$) at the interface as a function of time (in years) for both models with $T_{pm}^0 = 303$ K and $N_y = 90$.

$N_x \times N_y$	100×30	100×60	100×90
Basic Newton-min	×	×	×
Newton-min with projection	157/0/552/142	157/0/613/497	182/2/886/1360
and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	157/0/540/145	157/0/597/467	157/0/614/999
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	157/0/533/138	157/0/586/523	157/0/612/972

Table 5.2 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time for the three Newton-min methods obtained with $N_y = 30, 60, 90$ and $T_{pm}^0 = 333$ K.

shown that the basic Newton-min algorithm fails to converge in this test case and that the use of the equilibrium phase molar fractions for the phase appearance criteria is necessary to obtain the convergence for the finest mesh at $T_{pm}^0 = 303$ K. On the other hand, imposing the thermodynamic equilibrium at each Newton iterate improves only slightly the convergence.

6 1D and 2D geothermal test cases

In these test cases, the porous medium is homogeneous of porosity $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = 0.35$ and of isotropic permeability $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = K \times I$ with $K = 1$ D. The relative permeabilities are defined by $k_r^\alpha(S^\alpha) = (S^\alpha)^2$ for each phase $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}$. The capillary pressure function is given by the Corey law (see Figure 6.1)

$$P_c(S^g) = \begin{cases} -b \ln(1 - S^g) & \text{if } 0 \leq S^g \leq S_1 \\ -b \ln(1 - S_1) + \frac{b}{1 - S_1}(S^g - S_1) & \text{if } S_1 < S^g \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

with $b = 2 \cdot 10^5$ Pa and $S_1 = 0.99$. The capillary pressure is regularized for $S^g \in (S_1; 1]$ to allow for the disappearance of the liquid phase (see Figure 6.1). Since there is no entry capillary pressure (in the sense that $P_c(0) = 0$), the complementary constraints $\min(P_c(S^g), q^{l, atm}) = 0$ are equivalent to $\min(S^g, q^{l, atm}) = 0$. It results that the gas saturation can be used in the following test cases as primary unknown at the




Fig. 5.5 Mean relative humidity, mean temperature (in K) and molar flow rate of the water component (in $\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$) at the interface as a function of time (in years) for both models with $T_{pm}^0 = 333 \text{ K}$ and $N_y = 90$.

interface Γ rather than the capillary pressure P_c in Table (4.1). Different choices, including P_c and a variable switch between P_c and S^g are compared in paragraph 6.1.2.




Fig. 6.1 Relative permeabilities (left) of both phases k_r^α , $\alpha = g, l$ and capillary pressure P_c (right) as functions of the liquid saturation S^l .

The liquid and gas phases are a mixture of two components, the water denoted by w and the air denoted by a . The gas thermodynamic laws are defined by the perfect gas molar density $\zeta^g = \frac{P^g}{RT}$, with $R = 8.314 \text{ J} \cdot \text{K}^{-1} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ and the viscosity $\mu^g = (0.361T - 10.2) \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ Pa} \cdot \text{s}$. The liquid molar enthalpy h^l and the gas molar enthalpies of each component h_a^g, h_w^g are taken from [37]. The gas molar enthalpy is then defined by (2.1). The liquid molar density and viscosity are also from [37] and defined by

$$\zeta^l = \frac{(780.83795 + 1.62692T - 3.06354 \cdot 10^{-3} T^2)(1 + 0.651 C_s)}{0.018} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\mu^l = \frac{(1 + 1.34 C_s + 6.12 C_s^2) \cdot 10^{-3}}{0.02148(T - 273 - 8.435 + \sqrt{8078.4 + (T - 273 - 8.435)^2}) - 1.2} \text{ Pa} \cdot \text{s} \quad (6.2)$$

with the salinity fixed to $C_s = 35 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ Kg.Kg}^{-1}$. The mass density is defined by $\rho^\alpha = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^\alpha m_i \zeta^\alpha$ with the molar masses $m_a = 0.029$ and $m_w = 0.018 \text{ Kg.mol}^{-1}$. The vapour pressure $P_{sat}(T)$ is given by the Clausius-Clapeyron equation

$$P_{sat}(T) = 100 \exp \left(46.784 - \frac{6435}{T} - 3.868 \log(T) \right),$$

and the Henry constant of the air component is set to $H_a = 10^8 \text{ Pa}$. The molar internal energy of each phase is considered to be equal to its enthalpy. Finally, the fugacities are defined by

$$\begin{cases} f_i^g = C_i^g P^g, & i = a, w, \\ f_a^l = C_a^l H_a, \\ f_w^l = C_w^l P_{sat}(T) \exp \left(-\frac{P_{sat}(T) - P^l}{1000RT/0.018} \right). \end{cases}$$

6.1 1D geothermal test cases

The aim of the 1D test cases is to study the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition introduced in section 3 and in particular the appearance and disappearance of the liquid outflow. The domain is a box of length (0 m, 11000 m) and height (−3000 m, 1000 m) meshed with 1000 cells in the vertical direction. The initial condition is defined by a liquid phase $S^l = 1$ composed of pure water $C_w^l = 1$, $C_a^l = 0$ at hydrostatic pressure with $P^l = 1 \text{ atm}$ at the top boundary and a linear temperature between the temperature 300 K at the top boundary and the temperature 550 K at the bottom boundary. The lateral boundaries of the domain are thermally isolated (no Fourier flux) and impervious (no Darcy flux). In addition to the fixed temperature 550 K, we impose at the bottom boundary an input molar flow rate $q_{w,in} < 0$ composed of pure liquid water. The thermal conductivity is fixed to $\lambda = 3 \text{ W.m}^2.\text{K}^{-1}$ and the rock energy per unit volume is given by $E_r(T) = 2 \cdot 10^6 T$ in J.m^{-3} with T in K.

The soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition developed in section 3 is imposed at the top boundary. The short and long wave radiation coming from the atmosphere and reaching the soil surface is fixed to $(1 - a)R_s + R_a = 340 \text{ W.m}^{-2}$ and the soil emissivity to $\varepsilon = 0.97$. The convective molar and energy transfer coefficients are set to $H_m = 0.69 \text{ mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$ and $H_T = 29 \times H_m = 20 \text{ W.m}^{-2}.\text{K}^{-1}$. The far field atmospheric conditions are set to $C_{a,\infty}^g = 0.99$, $C_{w,\infty}^g = 10^{-2}$, $T_\infty^{atm} = 300 \text{ K}$ and $P^{atm} = 1 \text{ atm}$, corresponding to a relative humidity of 0.5. The precipitation recharge is not considered in these 1D test cases.

The simulations are run with $t_f = 1200$ years using an adaptive time stepping starting with an initial time step of 6 days and with a maximum time step of 700 days.

6.1.1 1D geothermal test case with appearance and disappearance of the outflow

In this test case, as exhibited in Figure 6.2, the time-dependent input molar flow rate

$$q_{w,in}(t) = \begin{cases} -2.9 \cdot 10^{-2} & \text{for } 0 < t \leq 300 \text{ years,} \\ 0 & \text{for } 300 < t \leq 900 \text{ years,} \\ -1.45 \cdot 10^{-2} & \text{for } 900 < t \leq t_f. \end{cases}$$

in $\text{mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$ is imposed at the bottom boundary in order to test the appearance and disappearance of the liquid outflow.

Figures 6.3 and 6.4 show the time evolution of the phase pressures, temperature and gas saturation both at the top cell and at the top boundary. Figure 6.5 exhibits the solutions obtained at the end of each




Fig. 6.2 Input molar flow rate $q_{w,in}(t)$ at the bottom boundary as a function of time.

	1D geothermal
Basic Newton-min	1880/252/12813/773
Newton-min with projection	804/12/3552/215
and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	850/24/3912/245
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	835/17/3812/247

Table 6.1 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time for the Newton-min algorithms for the dependent on time input molar flow rate.

period at times $t = 300, 900, 1200$ years.

Table 6.1 shows that the numerical performances are drastically increased when enforcing the complementary constraints of type $\min(X_1, X_2) = 0$ to hold exactly at each Newton iteration. The nonlinear appearance criteria slightly increases the total number of Newton iterations compared with the linear appearance criteria. Enforcing the thermodynamic equilibrium at each Newton iterate improves the Newton convergence but it still remains worse than the one obtained with linear appearance criteria.




Fig. 6.3 Relative humidity and gas and liquid molar flow rates (in $\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$) as functions of time, obtained for the dependent on time input molar flow rate.

Since there is no entry capillary pressure in this test case, the liquid outflow complementary constraints 3.15 is equivalent to $\min(S^g, q^{l,atm}) = 0$ which explains why, in Figures 6.3 and 6.4, the gas saturation at the interface is vanishing as soon as the liquid molar flow rate $q^{l,atm}$ is strictly positive. This can also be observed in Figure 6.5 in the gas saturation blue and red plots.

The solutions exhibited respectively at times $t = 300$ year and at final time correspond to the stationary states obtained with their respective input molar flow rate at the bottom boundary. During the time interval $300 \text{ years} < t \leq 900$ years, as there is no input flow rate at the bottom boundary, the liquid outflow and the gas molar flow rate vanish rapidly. The solutions at the end of this time interval exhib-




Fig. 6.4 Gas and liquid pressures (in MPa), temperature (in K) and gas saturation as functions of time both at the top boundary and at the top cell, obtained for the dependent on time input molar flow rate.

ited in green in Figure 6.5, show that the liquid phase drops and the gas phase rises by gravity. Only the gas phase is present at the top of the geothermal column for say $z \in (978, 1000)$ m. Note also that the stationary linear conductive solution for the temperature is far from being reached after 600 years at time $t = 900$ years. From 630 m to say 845 m, a step in the temperature curve can be noticed. This step corresponds to the domain where the fluid is diphasic and the air molar fraction in the gas phase vanishes. Neglecting the Kelvin correction and the dissolution of air in the liquid phase, the equality of the liquid and gas water fugacities imposes that $f_w^g = C_w^g P^g \sim P_{sat}(T)$. Since $f_w^g = C_w^g P^g$ is roughly equal to 1 atm, the temperature is also roughly constant.

6.1.2 1D geothermal test case with entry capillary pressure

In this test case, the input molar flow rate is fixed to $q_{w,in} = -2.9 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ during the overall simulation and the capillary pressure curve includes an entry pressure $P_e > 0$ defined by the following regularization of the Corey law (see Figure 6.6):

$$P_c(S^g) = \begin{cases} P_e - b \ln(1 - S^g) & \text{if } 0 \leq S^g \leq S_1 \\ P_e - b \ln(1 - S_1) + \frac{b}{1 - S_1} (S^g - S_1) & \text{if } S_1 < S^g \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

with $P_e = 10^5$ Pa, $b = 2 \cdot 10^5$ Pa and $S_1 = 0.99$. The Corey law is again regularized for $S^g \in (S_1; 1]$ to allow for the disappearance of the liquid phase.

The soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition (3.18) should account for capillary pressures $P^g - P^l$ in the interval $[0, P_e]$. It results that, for non zero entry pressures P_e , the gas saturation cannot be used anymore as primary unknown at the top boundary. Following [9, 10], let us introduce a parameter τ and two continuously differentiable non-decreasing functions

$$S : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad \mathcal{P}_c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

chosen such that

$$P_c(S(\tau)) = \mathcal{P}_c(\tau).$$




Fig. 6.5 Gas and liquid pressures (in MPa), temperature (in K) and gas saturation as functions of depth (in m) and air molar fraction in the gas phase obtained at times $t = 300$ years, 900 years and 1200 years for the dependent on time input molar flow rate.




Fig. 6.6 Capillary pressure (in Pa) with a non-zero entry pressure as a function of the liquid saturation.

Then, τ is defined as an additional unknown at the top boundary and equation $S^g = \mathcal{S}^g(P^g - P^l)$ in (3.18) is replaced by

$$S^g = \mathcal{S}(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad P^g - P^l = \mathcal{P}_c(\tau).$$

Two choices of parametrization $\mathcal{S}(\tau)$ and $\mathcal{P}_c(\tau)$ are compared in terms of convergence of the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm in Tables 6.2 and 6.3. The first choice uses the capillary pressure

scaled by the entry pressure P_e as parameter τ and is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}(\tau) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \tau \in [0, 1), \\ P_c^{-1}(P_e \tau) & \text{if } \tau \in [1, \frac{P_c(1)}{P_e}], \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{P}_c(\tau) = P_e \tau \text{ if } \tau \in [0, \frac{P_c(1)}{P_e}].$$

The second choice is based on a variable switch between the capillary pressure and the gas saturation which is shown in [9,10] to improve the nonlinear convergence and also allows to account for non invertible capillary functions. It is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}(\tau) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \tau \in [0, 1), \\ \tau - 1 & \text{if } \tau \in [1, 2], \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{P}_c(\tau) = \begin{cases} P_e \tau & \text{if } \tau \in [0, 1), \\ P_c(\tau - 1) & \text{if } \tau \in [1, 2]. \end{cases}$$

Tables 6.2 and 6.3 exhibit a significant gain in terms of nonlinear convergence obtained with the variable switch parametrization compared with the scaled capillary pressure.

	1D geothermal
Basic Newton-min	749/11/1874/135
Newton-min with projection and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	722/4/1487/115
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	719/5/1515/114

Table 6.2 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time for the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm using the scaled capillary pressure as parameter τ .

	1D geothermal
Basic Newton-min	731/4/1558/117
Newton-min with projection and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	718/2/1439/113
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	720/1/1428/115

Table 6.3 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time for the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm using the variable switch parametrization.




Fig. 6.7 Relative humidity and gas and liquid molar flow rates (in $\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$) at the top boundary as functions of time.




Fig. 6.8 Gas and liquid pressures (in MPa), temperature (in K) and gas saturation at the top boundary and at the top cell as functions of time.

The plots of Figures 6.7 and 6.8 highlight that the liquid outflow appears at the first time step and remains throughout the simulation. This is due to a high input molar flux at the bottom boundary which saturates the atmosphere at the top boundary. Figure 6.8 exhibits that the evaporation rate increases with the temperature at the top boundary while the liquid outflow decreases. The stationary state is reached after say 200 years for this test case and is very similar to the one obtained at the end of the first period of the previous test case.

6.2 2D Bouillante geothermal test cases

The two dimensional test case illustrated in Figure 6.9 represents a simplified 2D cut of the Bouillante geothermal reservoir. It is run with two different upper boundary conditions to compare the solutions obtained with the evaporation-outflow boundary condition introduced in section 3 and with Dirichlet boundary conditions. The initial and left side conditions are defined by a pure water liquid phase ($S^l = 1$, $C_w^l = 1$, $C_a^l = 0$) at hydrostatic pressure and by a linear temperature between the fixed top and bottom temperatures. The bottom boundary is impervious (no Darcy flux) with a fixed temperature of 400 K except in the interval $8000 \text{ m} \leq x \leq 10000 \text{ m}$ where a pure water liquid input flux of $-2.9 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ at 550 K is imposed. The right side of the domain is supposed thermally isolated (no Fourier flux) and impervious (no Darcy flux).

The top boundary conditions are test case dependent and are detailed below, except at the seabed boundary such that $z \leq 0 \text{ m}$, $x \leq 5000 \text{ m}$. The seabed boundary condition is defined by a pure water liquid phase ($S^l = 1$, $C_w^l = 1$) at hydrostatic pressure. The temperature is sea depth dependent. It is linear between the sea level $z = 0 \text{ m}$ at 300 K and $z = -100 \text{ m}$ at 278 K, then constant below $z = -100 \text{ m}$.

Two Voronoi meshes, a fine and a coarse mesh, satisfying the admissibility condition of TPFA schemes at both inner and boundary faces have been generated. The fine mesh contains approximatively 3500 cells (around 4000 degrees of freedom) and is refined at the neighbourhood of the top boundary with a volume ratio of 115 between the smallest and the largest cells of the mesh. The coarse mesh contains approximatively 1500 cells (about 1700 degrees of freedom) and the refinement at the interface is




Fig. 6.9 Illustration of the two dimensional domain and its boundary conditions.

characterized by a volume ratio of 22 between the smallest and the largest cells of the mesh.

The simulations are run over the time interval $[0, t_f]$, $t_f = 1000$ years, with an adaptive time stepping starting with an initial time step of 6 days in the Dirichlet case and of 1 day with the evaporation-outflow boundary condition. The maximum time step is fixed to 700 days in both cases.

6.2.1 2D geothermal test case with Dirichlet top boundary conditions

In this test case, the upper boundary is composed of three parts corresponding to the seabed ($z \leq 0$ m and $0 \leq x \leq 5000$ m) described above, a sunny plain zone ($0 < z \leq 500$ m and $5000 \text{ m} < x \leq 8450$ m) and a rainy mountain zone ($z > 500$ m and $8450 \text{ m} < x \leq 11000$ m). The sunny plain zone is defined with the same parameters than the far field atmospheric conditions used in subsection 6.2.2, which means that the relative humidity is fixed to 0.5, the temperature to 300 K and the gas pressure to $P^g = 1 \text{ atm}$ from which we deduce that only the gas phase with water and air molar fractions $C_a^g = 0.99$, $C_w^g = 10^{-2}$ is present. The rainy mountain zone is characterized by a diphasic fluid at thermodynamic equilibrium which is fitted in such a way that the liquid flux entering the domain is similar to the one obtained in subsection 6.2.2 with the evaporation-outflow top boundary condition including the precipitation recharge. Then, using the simulation results of subsection 6.2.2, the Dirichlet boundary condition for $z > 500$ m (which corresponds to $x > 8450$ m) is defined by

$$\begin{cases} S^g = 0.72, & S^l = 0.28, \\ P^g = 1 \text{ atm}, & P^l = -153671 \text{ Pa}, \\ C_a^g = 0.97, & C_w^g = 0.03, \\ C_a^l = 10^{-3}, & C_w^l = 0.999, \\ T = 300 \text{ K}. \end{cases}$$

Figure 6.10 exhibits the temperature and the gas saturation in the reservoir at final time. From Figure 6.10, let us remark that the high temperature flux goes out of the reservoir at the top boundary on both sides of the shoreline approximately in the interval $3575 \text{ m} \leq x \leq 5550 \text{ m}$. Inside this interval, we can observe a temperature drop in the interval $4800 \text{ m} < x < 5200 \text{ m}$. It is explained by the evaporation of the liquid phase which cools down the surface neighbourhood.

	Coarse mesh	Fine mesh
Basic Newton-min	638/15/2768/226	1002/98/6124/2041
Newton-min with projection and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	632/3/2395/220	632/6/2788/944
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	604/1/2302/207	623/9/2779/920

Table 6.4 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time obtained for the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm for both meshes with the Dirichlet top boundary condition.




Fig. 6.10 Temperature (in Celsius) and gas saturation at final time (1000 years) obtained with the fine mesh and the Dirichlet top boundary conditions.

6.2.2 2D geothermal test case with the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition

In this subsection, the Dirichlet conditions on the sunny plain and rainy mountain zones are replaced by the evaporation-outflow boundary condition developed in section 3. The radiation, the convective molar and energy transfer coefficients and the far field atmospheric conditions are those defined in subsection 6.1. The precipitation recharge is null on the sunny plain zone and fixed to $q^{l,rain} = -3.2 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ mol.m}^{-2}.\text{s}^{-1}$ on the rainy mountain zone with $C_w^{l,rain} = 0.999$ and $C_a^{l,rain} = 10^{-3}$. This precipitation recharge corresponds to roughly twice the observed rainfall of 9 m in 2016. It has been doubled since the reservoir 2D cut is assumed to be along a fault plane which favours the water intrusion.

	Coarse mesh	Fine mesh
Basic Newton-min	×	×
Newton-min with projection and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	620/5/2803/243	699/25/3850/1334
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	616/3/2727/246	670/14/3399/1240
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	622/3/2771/244	646/13/3368/1137

Table 6.5 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time obtained for the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm for both meshes and with the evaporation-outflow boundary condition.




Fig. 6.11 Temperature (in Celsius) and gas saturation at final time (1000 years) obtained with the fine mesh and the evaporation-outflow boundary condition.

Figure 6.11 exhibits the temperature and the gas saturation in the whole domain at final time. When compared with Figure 6.10, one can notice that at final time the evaporation-outflow boundary condition shifts the high temperature zone to the left, from (3575 m, 5550 m) at the top boundary for the Dirichlet boundary condition to (2950 m, 4575 m) for the evaporation-outflow boundary condition. This shift can be explained by the lower liquid pressure $P^l = P^{atm} - P_c(1)$ provided at the top boundary by the gas Dirichlet condition than the one provided by the evaporation-outflow boundary condition with in particular $P^l = P^g = P^{atm}$ between say $x = 5000$ m and $x = 6000$ m as a result of the liquid outflow. It also results that the temperature drop near the shoreline does no longer appear. The gas saturation remains null below the seabed and the desaturated zone is shifted to $x > 5000$ m. It can also be noticed that the desaturated zone is deeper with the evaporation-outflow than with the Dirichlet boundary condition.

In both Figures 6.10 and 6.11, convective thermal instabilities can be noticed which are induced artificially by the left Dirichlet boundary conditions. An efficient way to get rid off these artefacts is to model the sea water intrusion taking into account the additional salt component and the dependence of the liquid viscosity and mass density on the salinity. This is the object of the next test case.

6.2.3 2D geothermal test case with a water-air-salt thermodynamic system

In this subsection, the previous test case of subsection 6.2.2 is extended to take into account the dissolution of the salt component in the liquid phase. Since our model assumes all components to be present in both phases, the liquid and gas phases are now a mixture of three components, the water denoted by w , the air denoted by a and the salt denoted by s , setting $\mathcal{C} = \{w, a, s\}$. The liquid molar density (6.1) and viscosity (6.2) are functions of the salinity C_s in Kg.Kg^{-1} which is now related to the liquid molar fractions by

$$C_s = \frac{C_s^l m_s}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} C_i^l m_i},$$

with $m_s = 58.44 \cdot 10^{-3}$, $m_w = 18 \cdot 10^{-3}$, $m_a = 29 \cdot 10^{-3}$ Kg.mol^{-1} . The air and water fugacities in both phases are still given by (6.3) and the fugacities of the salt component are defined by

$$\begin{cases} f_s^g = C_s^g P^g, \\ f_s^l = C_s^l H_s, \end{cases}$$

with a very low Henry constant $H_s = 10^{-1}$ Pa in order to keep the vaporization of the salt component in the gas phase negligible.

The Dirichlet boundary condition at the interface between the sea and the reservoir now uses the input salinity $C_s = 35 \cdot 10^{-3}$ Kg.Kg^{-1} of the sea water. The input salinity at the left side of the reservoir as well as at the bottom boundary is fixed to the lower value $C_s = 20 \cdot 10^{-3}$ Kg.Kg^{-1} . The remaining boundary and initial conditions are unchanged compared with the previous test case, using a zero salinity for the initial water in the reservoir and for the precipitation recharge.

	Coarse mesh	Fine mesh
Basic Newton-min	×	×
Newton-min with projection and nonlinear phase appearance criteria	737/28/3422/415	734/36/4204/2063
Newton-min with projection and thermodynamic equilibrium	717/18/3178/389	706/26/3696/1826

Table 6.6 Number of time steps, of time step chops, total number of Newton iterations and CPU time obtained with the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm for both meshes and the air-water-salt test case.

Table 6.6 summarizes the convergence behaviour of the different versions of the Newton-min algorithm. Figure 6.12 exhibits the temperature, the gas saturation and the salt mass fraction in the liquid phase in the reservoir at final time.




Fig. 6.12 Temperature (in Celsius), gas saturation and salinity of the liquid phase (in $g.Kg^{-1}$) at final time (1000 years) obtained with the fine mesh and the air-water-salt test case.

It is clear from the comparison between Figure 6.12 and Figures 6.10, 6.11 that the sea water intrusion prevents as expected the development of the convective thermal instabilities from the left side of the reservoir. This is due to the higher salinity of the sea water compared with the left side and bottom salinity. It also explains why the high temperature zone is shifted to the right in this test case compared with the previous test case. The plot of the salt molar fraction in the liquid phase at final time in Figure 6.12 clearly shows that the reservoir is splitted in 3 zones depending on the source of the water flux, the sea water zone on the left, the rain water zone on the right and the high temperature water zone in between.

Tables 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 confirm that enforcing the complementary constraints to hold at each Newton iterate considerably improves the convergence compared with the basic Newton-min version. For the evaporation-outflow boundary condition and the air-water-salt test cases, the basic Newton-min algorithm fails to converge while the Newton-min algorithm with projection on the complementary constraints exhibits a good nonlinear convergence. In both cases, the nonlinear phase appearance criteria also improves significantly the nonlinear convergence while in most cases its combination with the thermodynamic equilibrium update somewhat reduces this improvement.

7 Conclusion

In this work, a new formulation for non-isothermal compositional gas liquid Darcy flows based on natural variables and using extended phase molar fractions has been introduced. The non-isothermal compositional model is coupled with an advanced soil-atmosphere boundary condition accounting for the vaporization of the liquid phase in the atmosphere, the convective molar and energy transfer, a liquid outflow condition as well as the precipitation recharge and the radiation. Newton-min algorithms with various improvements have been investigated to solve the nonlinear systems obtained at each time step after an Euler implicit time integration. The numerical efficiency of the formulation and the soil-atmosphere evaporation-outflow boundary condition have been studied on several 1D and 2D test cases including in particular a 2D cut of the Bouillante high energy geothermal field in Guadeloupe with both both air-water and air-water-salt thermodynamic systems. The importance for geothermal simulations of the top boundary condition taking into account the seabed, the sunny plain and the rainy mountain zones is enlightened by comparison with a fitted Dirichlet boundary condition. Regarding the nonlinear solver efficiency, it

is shown that enforcing the complementary constraints to hold at each Newton iterate considerably improves the nonlinear convergence. A more robust convergence is also obtained when using the nonlinear phase appearance criteria rather than its linearized version.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank the BRGM and the Provence-Alpes-Côte d’Azur Region for the co-funding of the PhD of Laurence Beaudé as well as the support of the CHARMS ANR project (ANR-16-CE06-0009).

References

1. Abadpour, A., Panfilov, M.: Method of negative saturations for modeling two-phase compositional flow with oversaturated zones. *Transport in Porous Media* **79**, 197–214 (2009)
2. ANCRE: Decarbonization Wedges. Tech. Rep. November (2015)
3. Angelini, O., Chavant, C., Chénier, E., Eymard, R., Granet, S.: Finite volume approximation of a diffusion-dissolution model and application to nuclear waste storage. *Math. Comput. Simul.* **81**, 2001–2017 (2010)
4. Aziz, K., Settari, A.: *Petroleum Reservoir Simulation*. Applied Science Publishers (1979)
5. Ben Gharbia, I., Jaffré, J.: Gas phase appearance and disappearance as a problem with complementarity constraints. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* (2013)
6. Bertani, R.: Geothermics Geothermal power generation in the world 2010–2014 update report. *Geothermics* **60**, 31–43 (2016). DOI 10.1016/j.geothermics.2015.11.003. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geothermics.2015.11.003>
7. Birge, N., Masson, R., Trenty, R.: A domain decomposition method to couple non-isothermal compositional gas liquid darcy and free gas flows (2017)
8. Bourgeat, A., Jurak, M., Smai, F.: Two-phase, partially miscible flow and transport modeling in porous media: application to gas migration in a nuclear waste repository. *Computational Geosciences* **13**, 29–42 (2009)
9. Brenner, K., Cancès, C.: Improving newton’s method performance by parametrization: The case of the richards equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **55**(4), 1760–1785 (2017)
10. Brenner, K., Groza, M., Jeannin, L., Masson, R., Pellerin, J.: Immiscible two-phase Darcy flow model accounting for vanishing and discontinuous capillary pressures: application to the flow in fractured porous media. *Computational Geosciences* (2017)
11. Byrdina, Ramos, Vandemeulebrouck, Masias, Revil, Finizola, Zuniga, G., Cruz, Antayhua, Macedo: Influence of the regional topography on the remote emplacement of hydrothermal systems with examples of ticsani and ubinas volcanoes. *Southern Peru. Earth and Planetary Science Letters* **365**, 152–164 (2013)
12. Chalhoub, M., Bernier, M., Coquet, Y., Philippe, M.: A simple heat and moisture transfer model to predict ground temperature for shallow ground heat exchangers. *Renewable Energy* **103**, 295–307 (2017)
13. Class, H., Helmig, R., Bastian, P.: Numerical simulation of non-isothermal multiphase multicomponent processes in porous media: 1. An efficient solution technique. *Advances in Water Resources* **25**, 533–550 (2002)
14. Coats, K.: Implicit compositional simulation of single-porosity and dual-porosity reservoirs. In: *SPE Symposium on Reservoir Simulation*. Society of Petroleum Engineers (1989)
15. Cui, Y., Gao, Y., Feber, V.: Simulating the water content and temperature changes in an experimental embankment using meteorological data. *Engineering Geology* **114**(3–4), 456–471 (2010)
16. Dentzer: Réévaluation du potentiel géothermique en ile de france. Ph.D. thesis (2016)
17. Droniou, J.: Finite volume schemes for diffusion equations: Introduction to and review of modern methods. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* **24**(8), 1575–1619 (2014)
18. Eymard, R., Gallouët, T., Herbin, R.: Finite volume methods. *Handbook of Numerical Analysis* **7**, 713–1018 (2000)
19. Eymard, R., Guichard, C., Herbin, R., Masson, R.: Vertex-centred discretization of multiphase compositional Darcy flows on general meshes. *Computational Geosciences* **16**(4), 987–1005 (2012)
20. Hurwitz, S., Kipp, K., Ingebrisen, S., Reid, M.: Groundwater flow, heat transport, and water table position within volcanic edifices: Implications for volcanic processes in the cascade range. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **108**(B12) (2003)
21. Kräutle, S.: The semi-smooth newton method for multicomponent reactive transport with minerals. *Advances in Water Resources* **34**, 137–151 (2011)
22. Lauser, A., Hager, C., Helmig, R., Wohlmuth, B.: A new approach for phase transitions in miscible multi-phase flow in porous media. *Advances in Water Resources* **34**, 957–966 (2011)
23. Lenzi, M., Schweiser, B.: Two-phase flow equations with outflow boundary conditions in the hydrophobic-hydrophilic case. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods and Applications* **73**(4), 840–853 (2010)
24. Limberger, J., Boxem, T., Pluymaekers, M., Bruhn, D., Manzella, A., Calcagno, P., Beekman, F., Cloetingh, S., van Wees, J.D.: Geothermal energy in deep aquifers: A global assessment of the resource base for direct heat utilization. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **82**(November 2016), 961–975 (2018). DOI 10.1016/j.rser.2017.09.084. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.09.084>
25. Lund, J.W., Boyd, T.L.: Direct utilization of geothermal energy 2015 worldwide review. *Geothermics* **60**, 66 – 93 (2016). DOI <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geothermics.2015.11.004>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S037565051500156X>
26. Marchand, E., Müller, T., Knabner, P.: Fully coupled generalized hybrid-mixed finite element approximation of two-phase two-component flow in porous media. part i: formulation and properties of the mathematical model. *Computational Geosciences* **17**, 431–442 (2013)

27. Masson, R., Trenty, L., Zhang, Y.: Formulations of two phase liquid gas compositional Darcy flows with phase transitions. *International Journal on Finite Volumes* **11**, 34 (2014)
28. Masson, R., Trenty, L., Zhang, Y.: Coupling compositional liquid gas darcy and free gas flows at porous and free-flow domains interface. *Journal of Computational Physics* **321**, 708 – 728 (2016)
29. Monteith, J.L., Unsworth, M.: *Principles of Environmental Physics*. Edward Arnold, London (1990)
30. Mosthaf, K., Baber, K., Flemisch, B., Helmig, R., Leijnse, A., Rybak, I., Wohlmuth, B.: A coupling concept for two-phase compositional porous-medium and single-phase compositional free flow. *Water Resources Research* **47** (2011)
31. O’Sullivan: Future directions in geothermal modelling. In: 35th New Zealand Geothermal Workshop. Rotorua, New Zealand. (2013)
32. O’Sullivan, J., Croucher, A., Yeh, A., O’Sullivan, M.: Improved convergence for air-water and co2-water tough2 simulations. In: New Zealand Geothermal Workshop (2013)
33. O’Sullivan, J.P., Ratouis, T.M.P., O’Sullivan, M.J.: Using reservoir models for monitoring geothermal surface features. *International Journal of Environmental, Chemical, Ecological, Geological and Geophysical Engineering* **9**(3), 195 – 205 (2015). URL <http://waset.org/Publications?p=99>
34. O’Sullivan, M.J., Pruess, K., Lippmann, M.J.: Geothermal reservoir simulation: The state-of-practice and emerging trends. *Geothermics* **30**(4), 395–429 (2001)
35. Pruess, K., Oldenburg, C., Moridis, G.: TOUGH2 user’s guide, version 2. Tech. Rep. LBNL-43134, Earth Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, University of California (1999). URL <http://esd.lbl.gov/files/research/projects/tough/documentation/TOUGH2-V2-Users.Guide.pdf>
36. Salimi, H., Wolf, K., Bruining, J.: Negative saturation approach for non-isothermal compositional two-phase flow simulations. *Transport in Porous Media* **91**, 391–422 (2012)
37. Schmidt, E.: Properties of water and steam in S.I. units. In: . Springer-Verlag (1969)
38. Schweiser, B.: Regularization of outflow problems in unsaturated porous media with dry regions. *Journal of Differential Equations* **237**, 278–306 (2007)
39. Vanderborght, J., Fetzner, T., Mosthaf, K., Smits, K., Helmig, R.: Heat and water transport in soils and across the soil-atmosphere interface: 1. theory and different model concepts. *Water Resources Research* **53**(2), 1057–1079 (2017)
40. Voskov, D., Tchelepi, H.: Comparison of nonlinear formulations for two-phase multi-component eos based simulation. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering* **82-83**, 101–111 (2012)
41. Xing, F., Masson, R., Lopez, S.: Parallel numerical modeling of hybrid-dimensional compositional non-isothermal darcy flows in fractured porous media. *Journal of Computational Physics* **345**, 637–664 (2017)