The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study: Process, Modeling Results, and Comparison to Experimental Data

Bernd Flemisch^{1*}, Jan M. Nordbotten^{2,3}, Martin Fernø⁴, Ruben Juanes⁵, Holger Class¹, Mojdeh
Delshad⁶, Florian Doster⁷, Jonathan Ennis-King⁸, Jacques
Franc⁹, Sebastian Geiger^{7,10}, Dennis Gläser¹, Christopher Green⁸, James Gunning⁸, Hadi Hajibeygi¹⁰, Samuel J.
Jackson⁸, Mohamad Jammoul⁶, Satish Karra¹², Jiawei Li⁹, Stephan K. Matthäi¹³, Terry Miller¹², Qi Shao¹³, Catherine Spurin⁹, Philip Stauffer¹², Hamdi Tchelepi⁹, Xiaoming Tian¹⁰, Hari Viswanathan¹², Denis
Voskov¹⁰, Yuhang Wang¹⁰, Michiel Wapperom¹⁰, Mary F.
Wheeler⁶, Andrew Wilkins¹⁴, AbdAllah A. Youssef¹³ and Ziliang Zhang¹⁰

 ^{1*}Department of Hydromechanics and Modelling of Hydrosystems, University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany.
 ²Center for Modeling of Coupled Subsurface Dynamics, Department of Mathematics, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
 ³Center of Sustainable Subsurface Resources, Norwegian Research Center, Bergen, Norway.
 ⁴Department of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway.
 ⁵Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
 ⁶Center for Subsurface Modeling, Oden Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA.

⁷Institute of Geoenergy Engineering, Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh, UK.
⁸CSIRO Energy, Clayton North, Australia.
⁹Department of Energy Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA.
¹⁰Department of Geoscience and Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands.
¹²Computational Earth Science, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, USA.
¹³Peter Cook Center for CCS Research & Department of Infrastructure Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia.
¹⁴CSIRO Mineral Resources, Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies, Kenmore, Australia.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): bernd@iws.uni-stuttgart.de; Contributing authors: jan.nordbotten@uib.no; martin.ferno@uib.no; juanes@mit.edu; holger.class@iws.unistuttgart.de; delshad@mail.utexas.edu; f.doster@hw.ac.uk; jonathan.ennis-king@csiro.au; jfranc@stanford.edu; s.geiger@tudelft.nl; dennis.glaeser@iws.uni-stuttgart.de; chris.green@csiro.au; james.gunning@csiro.au; h.hajibevgi@tudelft.nl: samuel.jackson@csiro.au; jammoul@utexas.edu; satkarra@lanl.gov; jiaweili@stanford.edu; stephan.matthai@unimelb.edu.au: tamiller@lanl.gov; shao.g@unimelb.edu.au; cspurin@stanford.edu; stauffer@lanl.gov; tchelepi@stanford.edu; x.tian-1@tudelft.nl; viswana@lanl.gov; d.v.voskov@tudelft.nl; v.wang-25@tudelft.nl; m.b.wapperom@tudelft.nl; mfw@ices.utexas.edu; andrew.wilkins@csiro.au; abdallahy@student.unimelb.edu.au; z.zhang-15@tudelft.nl;

Abstract

Successful deployment of geological carbon storage (GCS) requires an extensive use of reservoir simulators for screening, ranking and optimization of storage sites. However, the time scales of GCS are such that no sufficient long-term data is available yet to validate the simulators against. As a consequence, there is currently no solid basis for assessing the quality with which the dynamics of large-scale GCS operations can be forecasted.

Springer Nature 2021 IATEX template

The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study

To meet this knowledge gap, we have conducted a major GCS validation benchmark study. To achieve reasonable time scales, a laboratory-size geological storage formation was constructed (the "FluidFlower"), forming the basis for both the experimental and computational work. A validation experiment consisting of repeated GCS operations was conducted in the FluidFlower, providing what we define as the true physical dynamics for this system. Nine different research groups from around the world provided forecasts, both individually and collaboratively, based on a detailed physical and petrophysical characterization of the FluidFlower sands. The major contribution of this paper is a report and discussion of the results of the validation benchmark study, complemented by a description of the benchmarking process and the participating computational models. The forecasts from the participating groups are compared to each other and to the experimental data by means of various indicative qualitative and quantitative measures. By this, we provide a detailed assessment of the capabilities of reservoir simulators and their users to capture both the injection and post-injection dynamics of the GCS operations.

Keywords: geological carbon storage, validation benchmark, validation experiment, code intercomparison

1 Introduction

Geological carbon storage (GCS) has the potential to close the gap between CO_2 emissions from legacy carbon-based power sources and the required emission reductions as outlined in the IPCC reports [1–4]. Furthermore, GCS can play a role in negative emissions strategies in combination with biofuels [5], and in the production of so-called "blue hydrogen" [6]. In order to realize this potential in a safe and cost-efficient manner, large scale deployment of GCS relies heavily on modeling and numerical simulation studies to assess the suitability of potential geological formations (predominantly subsurface aquifers). Such modeling studies have been heavily relied upon in existing assessments of storage potential [7–12]. The generation of simulation-based data and knowledge in fields like GCS with huge societal impact eventually requires communication to political decision makers. Transparent simulation work flows, reproducibility of data and increased confidence in simulation results, e.g. as a result of comprehensive benchmarking, are key factors for communication or a participation of stakeholders in the modeling process [13].

On the other hand, only a few dozen large-scale carbon storage operations are currently active globally [14], and of these, none are in a post-injection phase following a multi-decadal injection period. As such, the modeling and simulation community does not have a robust data set to assess their forecasting skill, and significant uncertainty is associated with our ability to accurately capture the dominant physical processes associated with GCS. Pilot studies provide some measure of information [15, 16], yet the fundamental nature of the subsurface means that the data collected will always be relatively sparse, in particular spatially. As a partial remedy to this, several code comparison studies have been conducted [17–19]. However, none of these studies were conducted in the presence of a physical ground truth.

This study aims to provide a first assessment of the predictive skills of the GCS modeling and simulation community. To achieve this goal, we are exploiting the newly constructed "FluidFlower" experimental facility at the University of Bergen. Within this experimental rig, a geological model with characteristic features from the Norwegian Continental Shelf was constructed. Initial geological and petrophysical characterization was completed, together with a single-phase tracer test. With this basis, we conducted a double-blind study: On one hand, laboratory scale GCS was repeatedly conducted and measured at the University of Bergen, where the corresponding group will be labelled as ExpUB in the following. On the other hand, academic research groups active in GCS around the world were invited to participate in a forecasting study, coordinated by the University of Stuttgart, in the following indicated by CoordUS. Aided by the fact that the pandemic reduced academic travel, we were able to fully ensure that no physical interaction was present between the participating groups, and all digital communication was restricted, moderated, and archived to ensure the integrity of the double-blind study. As detailed in the following, the participants of the forecasting study were both asked to

provide independent forecasts, and then subsequently invited to update their forecasts in view of group interactions.

In this contribution, we report the final results of the comparison study, emphasizing 1) The degree of correlation between forecasts from the diverse set of participating groups, and 2) The degree of correlation between the forecasts and the measurements from the laboratory scale GCS conducted in the FluidFlower. Seen together, this provides both a measure of repeatability among forecasts (seen from an operational perspective), and also an indication of forecasting skill.

We structure the paper as follows. Section 2 introduces some basic required terminology, describes the validation experiment, and illustrates the benchmarking process. The participating groups and corresponding models are introduced in Section 3. In Section 4, the modeling results are presented and discussed by means of qualitative and quantitative assessments. Section 5 provides a comparison of the modeling results with the experimental data. A conclusion and an outlook are given in Section 6.

2 Benchmarking Methodology

We start this section by introducing some fundamental concepts and terminology based on [20, 21]. While the term *verification* describes "the process of determining that a computational model accurately represents the underlying mathematical model and its solution", *validation* refers to "the process of determining the degree to which a model is an accurate representation of the real world from the perspective of the intended uses of the model". In addition, *calibration* is the process of adjusting parameters in the computational model to improve agreement with data.

A validation experiment like the one presented below in Section 2.1 is "designed, executed, and analyzed for the purpose of quantitatively determining the ability of a mathematical model expressed in computer software to simulate a well-characterized physical process". As described in further detail below in Section 2.2, we perform a validation benchmark [20, 22], where the experiment provides measured data against which the simulation results are to be compared.

2.1 The validation experiment

In the following, we provide a very brief description of the experiment performed with the FluidFlower rig. For details, we refer to the original benchmark description [23] and the experimental paper [24]. Figure 1 shows the geometrical setup where the rig has been filled with sand of six different types to build up several layers of varying permeability, including three fault-like structures. Initially, the pore space was fully water-saturated and the top of the water



6 The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study

Fig. 1 Photograph image of the benchmark geometry with overlaid laser grid [23, Figure 8]. The brightest facies are the fine-sand barriers. The red circles indicate the injection points, while the purple circles depict the pressure sensors. Boxes A-C correspond to regions for the evaluation of different system response quantities.

table was subject to atmospheric conditions in terms of pressure and temperature¹. Gaseous CO_2 was injected over a total of five hours by means of two injection ports. The distribution of CO_2 throughout the rig was monitored over five days after the injection start. In total, five experimental runs were performed between November 2021 and January 2022. The experimental team ExpUB tried to establish identical operational conditions during the runs.

The description of the experimental setup in [23] addressed the external geometry, stratification, facies properties, faults, fluid properties, operational conditions and well test data. In particular, the stratification was described by high-resolution photographs, from which the participating groups had to determine the location of the different sand layers. This was complemented by details on the sedimentation process and pre-injection flushing procedures. Concerning the facies, information was provided on grain size distributions as well as on measurements of absolute permeability, porosity, relative permeability endpoints and capillary entry pressures. The purpose of the well test data was to allow for calibration of the numerical models. In particular, the provided pressure² and tracer flow data could be employed to estimate the permeability distribution over the different facies.

The description also defined the *System Response Quantities* (SRQs) which should be reported by the benchmark participants. The individual SRQs will be introduced in detail in Section 4.

¹Obviously, the density difference between CO_2 and water is much greater at this low pressure than it is at typical reservoir depths. We will address the relevance of our study for realistic GCS scenarios in Section 6.

 $^{^{2}}$ The injection pressures were reported at a sensor that was separated from the injection point by the length of small diameter tubing. Taking the pressure drop along that tubing into account influences the result of the calibration.

2.2 Benchmarking Process

Table 1 shows the chronology of the benchmark process. After a common preparation phase for finalizing the benchmark description [23], a so-called blind phase of three months started, where there was no direct communication between different participating groups or with ExpUB allowed. All upcoming

30.04.2021	Closed call for participation opens.
15.06.2021	Call closes.
15.07.2021	Preliminary benchmark description supplied to participants.
16.0719.08.2021	Preparation phase, discussion possible among all participants
	and ExpUB.
20.08.2021	Deadline for feedback on preliminary benchmark description.
16.09.2021	Kick-off Zoom meeting, second iteration of benchmark descrip-
	tion distributed.
17.0908.10.2021	Open discussion for finalizing the description.
08.10.2021	Final benchmark description circulated to participants.
09.10.2021-	Blind phase, no direct communication between different partic-
11.01.2022	ipants or with ExpUB.
09.01.2022	Deadline for submitting blind benchmark data.
12.01.2022	Virtual workshop and comparison of "fully blind" simulation
	forecasts.
12.0125.04.2022	Synchronization phase, communication between all participants
	enabled, but not with ExpUB.
22.04.2022	Deadline for submitting final benchmark data.
2628.04.2022	Workshop in Norway with presentation of final simulation
	forecasts, experimental results, model calibration study, and
	synthesis of results.

Table 1Chronology of the FluidFlower benchmark process.

issues of the modelers were directed to CoordUS and potentially anonymously forwarded to ExpUB. After agreeing on an answer between CoordUS and ExpUB, that answer was either broadcasted to all participating groups or given to the questioner only. At the end of the blind phase, each participating group provided initial forecasts to CoordUS. This was followed by a first meeting of all participating groups where the results were revealed and discussed, still without any involvement of ExpUB. This meeting initiated a so-called synchronization phase of another three months, allowing the forecasting groups to learn from each other's work and bring this knowledge into their own forecasts. In particular, the synchronization phase included two more common participant meetings. At its end, final forecasts were recorded before an in-person workshop outside of Bergen, Norway, where forecasts and experiments were compared for the first time.

In order to protect the integrity of the results, dedicated communication rules were followed during the different phases of the benchmarking process. To facilitate remote communication between participants, and also to store this communication for evaluating the benchmarking process, a Discord server

was set up³. Apart from a general channel that was initially open to everyone involved, a private channel was installed for each participating group which could be used for communicating with the benchmark organizers.

All result data was uploaded by the participants to Git repositories within a GitHub organization "FluidFlower"⁴. Each participating group got write access to a dedicated repository named after their institution. During the blind phase, only the participants themselves had access to their respective repositories. For the synchronization phase, read access to all participant repositories was granted for all participants. After the workshop in April, the repositories were opened further to include also the results from the physical experiments. Upon submission of this paper, the relevant repositories have been turned public.

3 Participating Groups and Models

In total, nine groups, each consisting of two to five individuals, participated in the FluidFlower benchmark study. In the following, they are indicated by the location or name of the corresponding institution as Austin, CSIRO, Delft-DARSim, Delft-DARTS, Heriot-Watt, LANL, Melbourne, Stanford and Stuttgart. Table 2 lists relevant modeling choices of the participating groups.

In terms of the partial differential equations constituting the main part of the mathematical model, almost all participants employ component mass balances. Apart from two exceptions Austin and Melbourne, the choice of spatial discretization is uniform with cell-centered finite volumes. All groups but Melbourne employ a standard implicit Euler time discretization and solve the resulting discrete equations in a fully-coupled fully-implicit manner. Things start to differ more when it comes to the constitutive relations. While the majority of the participants uses Brooks-Corey relationships for the capillary pressure and relative permeability, also other approaches such as linear relationships are employed. Moreover, various equations of state for determining the phase compositions as well as the phase densities are considered. Additionally to these principal choices, the participating computational models differ in their employed spatial parameters such as the assumed intrinsic permeabilities, porosities, residual saturations and others. These parameters may depend on the considered sand type, i.e., on the spatial location. They have been collected for each participating group in a file spatial_parameters.csv in the top level of the respective GitHub repository.

³https://discord.gg/8Q5fZS3T47

⁴https://github.com/fluidflower

Springer Nature 2021 ${\rm IAT}_{\rm E}{\rm X}$ template

The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study

_	·		·	·					· —
Software	# cells	Disc.	Domain volume [m ³]	Solubility limit [kg m ⁻³]	Density	EOS	$p_{ m c},k_{ m r}$	PDE_{s}	Туре
IPARS	9,100	MFEM	9.1e-2	1.496	[25]	[25]	BC	CMB	Austin
MOOSE [39]	44,284	CC-FV	8.65e-2	1.786	liquid: [34, 35], gas: [30]	[26, 27]	BC	CMB	CSIRO
DARSim [40]	43,758	CC-FV	8.3e-2	1.649	$\begin{bmatrix} \varrho_l = (\varrho_b^{\text{STC}} + \\ \varrho_{\text{CO2}}^{\text{STC}} R_S) / B_b, \\ [36] \end{bmatrix}$	[26]	BC	CMB	Delft-DARSim
DARTS [41]	48,274	CC-FV	9.2e-2	1.9	liquid: [34, 35], gas: [25]	liquid: [28], gas: [25]	const. $p_{\rm E}$, power law	CMB	Delft-DARTS
MRST-2021b [42]	42,000	CC-FV	8.4e-2	2.0	liquid: exp. with p , linear with CO_2 conc., gas: exp. with p		powerlaw for rel perms, BC for fine sands, vG for coarse sands	pseudo black oil	Heriot-Watt
FEHM [43], PFLOTRAN	42,000	CC-FV	8.4e-2	2.0	[30]	[29]	linear	CMB	LANL
CSMP++ [45]	14,822	DFEFVM	8.18e-2	$\left \begin{array}{c} f(p), 1.752 \text{ to} \\ 2.0093 \end{array}\right $	Derived from misci- bility data reported in [37]	[30, 31]	BC	pseudo black oil + trans- port of dis- solved CO ₂	Melbourne
AD-GPRS [46–49]	$\left \begin{array}{c} 6,094 \\ 21,392 \end{array}\right. /$	CC-FV	8.4e-2	1.5	[30, 38]	[29, 32, 33]	BC	pseudo black oil	Stanford
DuMu ^x [50]	26,099	CC-FV	8.75e-2	1.845	[30, 34]	[26, 27, 29]	BC	CMB	Stuttgart

 Table 2
 Modeling choices of the participating groups. Used abbreviations: component mass balances "CMB", phase mass balances "PMB", Brooks–Corey "BC", mixed finite elements "MFEM", cell-centered finite volumes "CC-FV", collocated finite-element finite-volume method with embedded discontinuities "DFEFVM".

4 Modeling Results

In the following, we provide and discuss the modeling results which are requested in form of SRQs by the benchmark description. They are grouped into three categories: dense data spatial maps in Section 4.1, dense data time series in Section 4.2, and sparse data in Section 4.3.

4.1 Dense data spatial maps

The participants were asked to provide snapshots of the spatial phase distribution at 24, 48, 72, 96 and 120 h after injection start, particularly, the saturation of gaseous CO_2 as well as the concentration of CO_2 in the liquid phase. While each participating group was free to define the computational grid for performing simulations, results should be reported on a uniform grid consisting of 1 cm by 1 cm cells.

4.1.1 Saturation

Figures 2 to 6 visualize the reported saturation values for all participating groups at the selected daily time steps. Focusing first on Figure 2, it can be observed that most participants report a very similar CO_2 plume shape under the lower fine sand barrier after 24 h. Moreover, no or almost no gaseous CO_2 is



Fig. 2 Spatial distribution of gaseous CO_2 after 24 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 CO_2 saturation indicated by blue, the maximum at 1 indicated by red.

reported within Box B after one day. Considerably less agreement can be seen for the upper barrier in the right part of the domain. This can be explained by the fact that the amount of CO_2 injected in the lower and upper part differs by a factor of more than 2 and, correspondingly, a variation in the dissolution behavior becomes visible earlier in the upper part of the domain. With Heriot-Watt and LANL, two participants report that no or almost no gaseous CO_2 is present throughout the domain after the first day of simulation. In case



Fig. 3 Spatial distribution of gaseous CO_2 after 48 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 CO_2 saturation indicated by blue, the maximum at 1 indicated by red.

of Heriot-Watt, this is due to the choice of the van-Genuchten relationship for the capillary pressure, as explained in more detail below in Section 4.2. The reported results are the ones with the smallest capillary fringe that was possible to resolve within the computing time constraints and an overestimation of dissolution was anticipated. The situation is different for LANL, where CO_2 leaves the system because almost no trapping occurs, see also below.

Examining the saturation distributions over the different time steps in Figures 2 to 6 reveals the effect of the varying dissolution behaviors. In partic-



Fig. 4 Spatial distribution of gaseous CO_2 after 72 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 CO_2 saturation indicated by blue, the maximum at 1 indicated by red.

ular, CSIRO, Delft-DARSim, Delft-DARTS and Melbourne report a vanishing CO₂ gas plume over time, while the plume shape stays rather constant for Austin, Stanford and Stuttgart. Starting with 72 h, Heriot-Watt did not report any spatial map data.



Fig. 5 Spatial distribution of gaseous CO_2 after 96 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 CO_2 saturation indicated by blue, the maximum at 1 indicated by red.



Fig. 6 Spatial distribution of gaseous CO_2 after 120 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 CO_2 saturation indicated by blue, the maximum at 1 indicated by red.

4.1.2 Concentration

Analogous to the saturation, Figures 7 to 11 visualize the reported concentration values for all participating groups at the selected daily time steps. While at first glance, the variation in the results appears to be larger than for the saturation, the reported qualitative behavior is similar for most groups. The CO_2 dissolves into the liquid phase and, due to the density difference between pure and CO_2 -enriched water, the latter is moving downwards by developing fingers. This motion is impeded by fine-sand barriers or the bottom of the domain. A clear outlier to this rather uniform qualitative behavior is given by LANL, whose simulations indicate that CO_2 has moved relatively straight upward without being hindered substantially by the fine-sand barriers. A variety of possible reasons exist, ranging from differently interpreted facies geometries and realized computational grids over too small variations in spatial parameters up to



Fig. 7 Spatial distribution of CO_2 concentration in the liquid phase after 24 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 kg m^{-3} indicated by blue, the maximum at 1.8 kg m^{-3} indicated by red.



Fig. 8 Spatial distribution of CO_2 concentration in the liquid phase after 48 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 kg m^{-3} indicated by blue, the maximum at 1.8 kg m^{-3} indicated by red.

insufficient constitutive relationships. As running two codes with PFLOTRAN and FEHM yielded similar results, the exact reason could not be determined during the course of the study.

The main quantitative differences which can be observed among the remaining groups arise due to the different speeds at which dissolution is taking place. In particular, dissolution for Heriot-Watt and Stanford appears to be much faster than for the other participating groups. Moreover, quite some disagreement can be observed on how much CO_2 is reaching the upper left part of the domain, i.e., Box B, via the corresponding fault zone.

Another interesting measure is the amount and respective thickness in horizontal direction of the evolving fingers. Differences here can be largely



Fig. 9 Spatial distribution of CO_2 concentration in the liquid phase after 72 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 kg m^{-3} indicated by blue, the maximum at 1.8 kg m^{-3} indicated by red.



Fig. 10 Spatial distribution of CO_2 concentration in the liquid phase after 96 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 kg m^{-3} indicated by blue, the maximum at 1.8 kg m^{-3} indicated by red.

attributed to correspondingly different grid resolutions. For example, the participating groups CSIRO, Delft-DARSim and Delft-DARTS with relatively high resolution (cf. Table 2) show substantially more and thinner fingers than Austin and Melbourne with a relatively low resolution.

4.1.3 Quantitative Comparison

As a quantitative measure, we apply the Wasserstein metric to analyze the difference between two snapshots. This metric works on distributions of equal mass and measures "the minimal effort required to reconfigure the mass of one distribution in order to recover the other distribution" [51] In order to apply the Wasserstein metric to the reported results, which in general have a



Fig. 11 Spatial distribution of CO_2 concentration in the liquid phase after 120 h. The minimum for the color map is at 0 kg m^{-3} indicated by blue, the maximum at 1.8 kg m^{-3} indicated by red.

slightly different mass (see detailed discussion in section 4.2.1), we first approximate roughly the CO_2 mass density in each cell by combining the reported concentration and saturation values via the formula

$$\widetilde{m} = \varrho_{\rm g} s + c(1-s).$$

Above, s and c indicate the saturation and concentration value, while the density $\rho_{\rm g}$ of gaseous CO₂ is set to $2 \, {\rm kg \, m^{-3}}$ to reflect the experimental conditions. The resulting values can be visualized by corresponding grayscale pictures which have been uploaded to the participants' data repositories. The final step to make these values comparable is their normalization such that they can be treated formally as two-dimensional probability distributions over the experimental domain. Given the normalized values, the Python library POT [52] can be applied to calculate the Wasserstein distances. The values are listed in Appendix A for every requested individual timestep. The full data including distances between results from different timesteps is provided in the FluidFlower general GitHub repository. This approach provides a reasonable approximation for the groups with approximately equal mass in the reported results, however, it is not appropriate for the results from LANL, whose simulations indicate that a significant fraction of the injected mass leaves the domain. Therefore, the results from LANL are excluded from the Wasserstein distance calculations.

We illustrate the calculated Wasserstein distances exemplarily for the first and last time step in Figure 12. The values have been dimensionalized by multiplying with the real mass of CO_2 in the system and are provided in units of gram times centimeter. Thus a value of 100 gr.cm corresponds to one gram of mass (e.g. about 20% of the CO_2 in the system) being shifted by one meter (e.g. about one third of the full simulation domain). Values on the order of 100 gr.cm or less thus correspond to what we consider relatively close



Fig. 12 Wasserstein distances in gram times centimeter for the first and last time step. Colors range from white for low values to red for high values. A value on a diagonal is the mean value of the respective row/column. Values above the diagonal are not displayed as they are symmetric. As no spatial map has been reported by Heriot-Watt for 120 h, the corresponding fields are left empty.

results, while results in significant excess of 100 gr.cm indicate substantial discrepancies. Figure 12 thus quantifies the qualitative results discussed in the subsections above. In particular, the spatial maps from Heriot-Watt and Stanford show the largest distances to the other groups over all time steps. Their mean distances are between two and three times larger than the ones from the other groups, due to their different dissolution behavior. Overall, the mean distances are mostly decreasing from the first to the last time step, as CO_2 further dissolves in the water and its mass distributes more over the domain.

4.2 Dense data time series

The participating groups were instructed to report several scalar SRQs in tenminute intervals over a time span of five days: total mass of CO_2 inside the domain, pressure at two locations, phase composition in Boxes A and B, as well as convection in Box C.

4.2.1 Total mass of CO_2

Figure 13 depicts the temporal evolution of the total mass of CO_2 inside the computational domain, as reported by the different participating groups. The benchmark description prescribes the injection rates in terms of Standard Cubic Centimeters per Minute (SCCM) [23]. While the underlying standard conditions are not explicitly specified, the instrument employed by ExpUB uses the NIST definition of standard conditions, i.e. 293.15 K and 1.013 bar. This would yield a final total mass of approximately 8.5 g, assuming that no CO_2 leaves the domain. While the majority of the modeling groups employed the corresponding interpretation of standard conditions, three groups report a higher value of approximately 9.4 g. With LANL, one group reports considerable lower values which is due to the fact that CO_2 leaves the domain, as has been explained in more detail in Section 4.1. In most results, the total amount of CO_2 stays constant after injection stops, indicating that no mass leaves the



Fig. 13 Temporal evolution of the total CO_2 mass inside the computational domain.

system. Nevertheless, some groups report a further increase or also a further decrease, which can partially be explained by numerical effects [53] or again the circumstance that gaseous CO₂ leaves the computational domain, respectively.

4.2.2 Pressure

The next reported SRQ is the temporal evolution of the pressure, measured at two sensors in the domain. Figure 14 illustrates the reported results. Most



Fig. 14 Temporal evolution of the pressure at two locations inside the computational domain, Sensor 1 (left) and Sensor 2 (right).

of the results show at most a minor influence of the CO_2 injection on the observed pressure values. The pressure at each sensor stays rather constant at the prescribed initial and possibly boundary conditions which correspond to an assumed ambient atmospheric pressure plus the effect of the water table. Nevertheless, two groups, **Stanford** and Melbourne, report a considerable influence of the injection processes. In order to examine this in more detail, Figure 15 depicts a zoom into the first ten hours of simulation. The results



Fig. 15 Temporal evolution of the pressure at two locations inside the computational domain, Sensor 1 (left) and Sensor 2 (right). Zoom into the first six hours.

from Melbourne show a considerable increase only for the first sensor which decays slowly to a constant level after the stop of injection. Here, the difference in the buildup between the two sensors can be explained by their respective proximity to the injection wells. In contrast to this, Stanford reports the same pressure buildup for both sensors. This can be explained by the fact that no-flow boundary conditions are used everywhere and the fluids are assumed to be incompressible. Notably, both groups report a stop of the pressure buildup at around 3.5 hours, before the stop of CO_2 injection at 5 hours.

4.2.3 Phase composition

In the following, we discuss the reported distribution of CO_2 over the two fluid phases in Boxes A and B. In particular, the participants reported the evolution of the amount of mobile and immobile gaseous CO_2 , CO_2 dissolved in the liquid phase, as well as CO_2 contained in the seal facies. We first focus on Box A and the respective Figure 16. It can be seen immediately that the variation of the results across the participating groups is much larger than for the previous SRQs. All results have in common that mobile gaseous CO_2 reaches a peak value at approximately five hours (coinciding with the injection stop) and then dissolves at different rates. Eight results can be grouped into three clusters showing a similar rate. The largest cluster consists of the participants CSIRO, Delft-DARSim, Delft-DARTS and Melbourne. Here, the dissolution takes place over the whole simulation period at an intermediate rate compared to the other two clusters. The two participants Austin and Stuttgart both show after an initial decay a very slow dissolution behavior. In contrast to this, Heriot-Watt and Stanford predict the fastet dissolution with zero mobile gaseous CO₂ left after less than one day. However, Stanford reports a very high amount of gaseous CO_2 becoming immobile, due to their employed identification of immobile gas leading to an overestimation. An outlier can be identified by LANL, where no CO_2 at all reaches Box A. All these observations



The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study 1

Fig. 16 Temporal evolution of the CO_2 phase distribution in Box A.

are consistent with the results and discussion concerning the spatial maps in Section 4.1. In addition here, a remarkable characteristic is the step-like progression of several curves, as reported particularly by CSIRO, Delft-DARSim and Stuttgart. This numerical effect is due to grid-dependent bursts in dissolution when the water-gas contact coincides with cell faces. It has also been observed initially by Heriot-Watt, who decided to employ the capillary pressure - saturation relationship by van Genuchten for the coarser sands in order to prevent the effect, see also Table 2.

Turning to Box B and Figure 17, the results exhibit even more variation. This can be attributed to the location of the box with the challenge of quantifying how much CO_2 reaches the fault zone in the lower left and subsequently the upper left region of the domain. While all participants predict the disappearance of mobile gaseous CO_2 after at most two days, the peak amount varies strongly between zero and 0.6 g. These different peak amounts together with different dissolution rates explain the high variation in dissolved CO_2 as seen in Figure 17. On a positive note, almost all models predicting a substantial amount of CO_2 in Box B report very similar times of appearance.

4.2.4 Convection

As a measure for convection, the participants where asked to report the total variation of concentration within Box C over time, see the definition of M(t)



20 The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study

Fig. 17 Temporal evolution of the CO_2 phase distribution in Box B.

in [23, Section 2.8.3]. The results are depicted in Figure 18. A relatively large



Fig. 18 Temporal evolution of M(t) as a measure for convection in Box C.

spread with peak values ranging from 0 to 3 m can be observed. Also the dynamic behavior is very different, ranging from a monotone increase to rather strong oscillations. Nevertheless, most participants report a stabilization over time to a stationary value between 0.5 and 1 m.

4.3 Sparse data

In this section, we describe the reported so-called sparse data. Each of the sparse data items had to be reported as six numbers, representing the prediction of the mean quantity as obtained by the experiments (stated in terms of P10, P50 and P90 values), as well as the prediction in the standard deviation of the quantity over the ensemble of experiments (again stated as P10, P50, and P90 values). Since most groups didn't report any P10 and P90 values for the expected standard deviations, we only consider the P50 values for the following comparisons. As basis for generating the predictions and uncertainties, any preferred methodology could be chosen, ranging from ensemble runs and formal methods of uncertainty quantification until human intuition from experience. We start with the maximum pressure at the two sensors, then focus on the times of maximum mobile gaseous CO_2 in Box A and onset of convective mixing in Box C, before we investigate the predicted phase distributions after three days in Boxes A and B.

4.3.1 Maximum pressure at the two sensors

The participants were asked for the expected maximum pressure at Sensors 1 and 2 as a proxy for assessing the risk of mechanical disturbance of the overburden. The reported values are depicted in Figure 19. As can be seen from the scaling of the vertical axis, all participating groups report very similar pressure values. Most groups also report P10, P50 and P90 values for the expected mean which are very close to each other, with the largest difference for one group being around 10 mbar. With Austin and Melbourne, only two groups expect any substantial standard deviation over the ensemble of experiments. The difference over all groups between the minimum P10 and maximum P90 reported pressure value is less than 40 mbar for each of the two sensors. This indicates that the typical variation in atmospheric pressure at the location of the experimental rig was not taken into account, exceeding 50 mbar over the winter months. Although the exact days of the experimental runs have not been provided explicitly to the participants, the information on the usual pressure variation is publicly available⁵.

4.3.2 Times of maximum mobile gaseous CO₂ in Box A and onset of convective mixing in Box C

We now focus on the time of maximum mobile gaseous CO_2 in Box A as a proxy for when leakage risk starts declining. The corresponding reported values are visualized in the upper picture of Figure 20. The majority of the participating groups now report substantial differences between the P10 and P90 values of both the expected mean and standard deviation. Nevertheless, several groups are very certain on the expected mean value and report only very narrow ranges. The variation between the groups is considerably larger

 $^{{}^{5} \}rm https://weatherspark.com/h/s/148035/2021/3/Historical-Weather-Winter-2021-at-Bergen-Flesland-Norway Figures-Pressure$



Fig. 19 Reported sparse data for the maximum pressure at sensors 1 and 2. Bottom, middle and top horizontal lines of the boxes indicate the reported P10, P50 and P90 values for the expected mean value, respectively. Dashed vertical lines extend from the mean values by \pm the reported P50 of the expected standard deviations.

than for the pressure discussed above. This is well explainable by the larger variation in the modeling results as discussed in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

As a proxy for the ability to capture the onset of convective mixing, we focus on the time for which the quantity M(t) defined in [23, Section 2.8.3] first exceeds 110% of the width of Box C, as depicted in the lower picture of Figure 20. We first note that three groups don't report any value at all. Out of the remaining six, four report very similar values around 4 h and narrow ranges between P10 and P90. With CSIRO, one group reports much larger expected values and also variations between P10 and P90. In order to examine this in more detail, we perform a comparison with the corresponding temporal evolution of M(t) as depicted in Figure 18. With 110% of the width of Box C being equal to 1.65 m, we can observe that several results don't reach this value at all over the whole simulation period. In turn, this explains that three groups didn't report any value for the sparse data. Zooming closer into the first ten hours of simulated time as done in Figure 21 allows to put the reported time series values in explicit relation to the sparse data. As can be identified from the vertical lines representing the reported expected mean values, the measured value for M(t) is usually well below the 110%. Therefore, it becomes obvious that several participating groups didn't rely only on the reported simulation results for the measurable considered here.



Fig. 20 Reported sparse data for the times of maximum mobile gaseous CO_2 in Box A (top) and for which the integral M(t) first exceeds 110% of the width of Box C (bottom). Bottom, middle and top horizontal lines of the boxes indicate the reported P10, P50 and P90 values for the expected mean value, respectively. Dashed vertical lines extend from the mean values by \pm the reported P50 of the expected standard deviations.

4.3.3 Phase distributions after three days in Boxes A and B

We now turn to the reported sparse data for the phase distribution in Box A at 72 hours after injection starts as a proxy for the ability to accurately predict near well phase partitioning. From the corresponding Figure 22, it can be seen immediately that the reported ranges between the P10 and P90 values of the expected mean values are substantially larger than for the preceding measures, going along with increased expected standard deviations. Concerning the amount of mobile gaseous CO_2 , the expected P50 of the mean value ranges between 0.5 and 2g, while for the amount of dissolved CO_2 , values range mostly between 1 and 4g.

The expected phase distribution in Box B at 72 hours after injection starts is depicted in Figure 23, interpretable as a proxy for the ability to handle uncertain geological features. It can be observed that mostly no mobile gaseous CO_2 is expected, while the associated uncertainty is considered to be quite high. In case of Stanford, the large variation comes from the fact that a simulation with immiscible fluid phases was included in the underlying uncertainty quantification as a limit case. Turning to the lower left picture, the amounts of predicted dissolved CO_2 show a strong variation over the participating groups.



Fig. 21 Zoom into the first ten hours of the temporal evolution of M(t). The black horizontal dashed line depicts 110% of Box C, dashed vertical lines correspond to the reported expected mean values.



Fig. 22 Reported sparse data for the phase distribution in Box A at 72 hours after injection starts. Bottom, middle and top horizontal lines of the boxes indicate the reported P10, P50 and P90 values for the expected mean value, respectively. Dashed vertical lines extend from the mean values by \pm the reported P50 of the expected standard deviations.

4.3.4 Total CO_2 mass in top seal facies within Box A

As the last measurable, we examine the expected total mass of CO_2 in the top seal facies at final time within Box A for evaluating the ability to capture migration into low-permeable seals. Figure 24 depicts the corresponding reported results. Also here, large variations can be observed, not only in the expected mean values, but also in the expected standard deviations.



Fig. 23 Reported sparse data for the phase distribution in Box B at 72 hours after injection starts. Bottom, middle and top horizontal lines of the boxes indicate the reported P10, P50 and P90 values for the expected mean value, respectively. Dashed vertical lines extend from the mean values by \pm the reported P50 of the expected standard deviations.



Fig. 24 Reported sparse data for the total mass of CO_2 in the top seal facies at final time within Box A. Bottom, middle and top horizontal lines of the boxes indicate the reported P10, P50 and P90 values for the expected mean value, respectively. Dashed vertical lines extend from the mean values by \pm the reported P50 of the expected standard deviations.

5 Comparison to Experimental Data

In the following, we will compare the modeling results described in the previous section with the actually observed experimental data. The underlying experimental methodology and original dataset is presented in [24], while the image

analysis approach is discussed in [54]. We focus first on the dense data spatial maps and time series and investigate afterwards the sparse data measurables.

5.1 Dense data spatial maps

In the following, we compare daily spatial maps given in form of segmentation data. For the experiments, this data has been generated by analyzing corresponding images using the newly developed toolbox DarSIA [54]. In Figure 25, the snapshots at 24 h are shown for five experimental runs. Visually, there is



Fig. 25 Segmentation data after 24h for five experimental runs. Black, green and red indicate pure water, water with dissolved CO_2 and gas, respectively.

a very good agreement over all five runs and differences can only be detected in the details. One slight exception is given by the fourth run, where no gas appears to be present in the upper right part of the domain. However, this is attributable to numerical effects in the image analysis procedure, rather than a different physical truth. We will perform a quantitative analysis further below.

Before that, a visual comparison with the modeling results is carried out. For this, the concentration and saturation maps at 24 h provided by the participants are converted into segmentation data. To allow for a more direct comparison, the modeling results are overlaid by the contour lines corresponding to the experimental data. The result is shown in Figure 26. It can be seen that the locations of the two gas plumes are reasonably well captured by several models, namely, Austin, CSIRO, Delft-DARSim, Delft-DARTS, Melbourne and Stuttgart, while their sizes are overestimated in general. As already suggested by the strong variability of the concentration distributions discussed in Section 4.1, considerably less agreement can be observed concerning the region covered by water with dissolved CO_2 . This becomes particularly apparent for Box B in the upper left part of the domain, where only the CSIRO modeling result matches the basic shape and extension in a visually satisfactory way.

To develop a more quantitative understanding, a similar analysis as in Section 4.1.3 can be performed in terms of the Wasserstein metric. This involves calculating distances for all pairs consisting of two participating groups, two experimental runs, or one participant and one run. Similar to above, the mean distances to the other modeling results and now also to the experimental data can be calculated, yielding two values for each segmentation



The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study 27

Fig. 26 Comparison of segmentation data after 24 h. Each modeling result is overlaid by the contour lines of experimental run 2. The forecasts are colored by black, pale green and pale red, indicating pure water, water with dissolved CO_2 and gas, respectively. Concerning the experimental data, yellow contour lines indicate the region of water with dissolved CO_2 , while blue lines illustrate the gas plume.

map. Figure 27 plots these values for all segmentation maps at the selected time steps. We can observe that the experimental data sets are within 50 gr.cm of each other, confirming that the experimental repeatability is strong, and that there is only minor impact of the different experimental conditions (primarily attributed to atmospheric pressure, some chemical alterations within the experimental rig, and a very minor amounts settling of sand throughout the experimental period). About half of the modeling results are within about 100 gr.cm of the experimental data for all reporting times, which we consider a relatively good match. At the final time, the closest simulation results are as little as 50 gr.cm away from the experimental mean, which is within twice the experimental variability at that time. This also aligns with the visual impressions for the segmented images shared above. With increasing time, the distances to both the experiments and the forecasts are decreasing for most modeling results; the same holds for the distances of the experimental data sets to the forecasts. This can be explained by the increasing spread of CO₂-rich water over the domain and a corresponding equilibration of CO_2 mass.

5.2 Dense data time series

In the following, we compare selected dense data time series as reported by the participating groups with corresponding experimental data. As described in [24, 54], the derivation of saturation and concentration values from the experimental photographs is a very challenging endeavor based on several assumptions. The correspondingly calculated mass values are subject to significant uncertainties. Therefore, the degree of physical truth behind the comparisons has to be taken with great care.

Figure 28 shows the comparison for the temporal evolution of the phase distribution in Box A. For being able to observe more details in the beginning





Fig. 27 Wasserstein distances of the segmentation maps to experiments and forecasts. Zoom into the ranges from 0 to 120 gr.cm for the mean distance to the experimental results and from 70 to 180 gr.cm for the mean distance to the modeling forecasts. Some groups with outlying results are therefore not visible in all plots, while Heriot-Watt and Stanford are consistently outside the range of the plots (confer distances in Figure 12).

of the investigated time frame, the x-axes in the pictures use a logarithmic scaling. Concerning mobile gaseous CO_2 , the basic shape of the experimental mean is quite similar to the median of the modeling results. Nevertheless, the peak value for the forecast is considerably lower than the experimental one. The spread of the modeling results during the advection-driven stage of increasing values is substantially less than during the dissolution-driven stage of decreasing values afterwards. This results in a much longer period where the value stays rather constant. While in general the stages of increasing and decreasing values are lagging behind the experimental results, the results from CSIRO and Stuttgart match the first stage very well.

Focusing on the temporal behavior of the dissolved CO_2 mass, it can be seen that most of the modeling results agree well with the experimental data in the beginning. The spread in the forecasts starts to increase after the injection stops and the very different dissolution behaviors discussed earlier become dominant. While most modeling results underestimate the amount of dissolved CO_2 during the majority of the simulated time, the values tend to increase longer than the corresponding experimental data which saturates earlier. Investigating the third picture, the evolution of the CO_2 mass in the seal varies strongly over the participating groups and differs substantially from the experimental data. A possible reason for the non-monotonic behavior of the experimental mean is discussed in [24].



Fig. 28 Comparison between modeling forecasts and experimental observations for the temporal evolution of the CO_2 phase distribution in Box A. A brown line depicts the median of the reported modeling results, while the associated pale brown region illustrates the area between the corresponding first and the third quartile. A black line shows the mean of the experimental data, while the associated grey region depicts the corresponding variation by means of the standard deviation.

Experimental data has been provided for two other time series and the corresponding comparisons are illustrated in Figure 29. Turning first to the amount of dissolved CO_2 in Box B, the large variations in the modeling results are also apparent by the depicted large spread. Like for Box A, the advectiondriven increase in the beginning is captured well by two participating groups. Also here, the differences become more pronounced after injection stops. The amount of CO_2 increases further in the experimental data over time due to CO_2 -rich water entering Box B from the right. This effect is not captured by most of the models.

We investigate finally the temporal evolution of the convection measure M(t) in the right picture of Figure 29. However, the differences of the modeling results to the experimental data are too strong to draw any meaningful conclusion here. It is likely that this has to do with the fact that the numerical evaluation of the integral value is not straightforward, strongly discretization-dependent and has been left entirely to the participants.

5.3 Sparse data

The collection of the sparse data results has been accompanied by questionnaires for monitoring the confidence of each participant in their own prediction



Fig. 29 Comparison between modeling forecasts and experimental observations for the temporal evolution of the dissolved CO_2 mass in Box B (left) and the integral quantity M(t) (right). A brown line depicts the median of the reported modeling results, while the associated pale brown region illustrates the area between the corresponding first and the third quartile. A black line shows the mean of the experimental data, while the associated grey region depicts the corresponding variation by means of the standard deviation.

as well as in the ones of the respective other working groups. Since the description and analysis of this process and its results would be beyond the scope of this work, a separate paper is devoted to this [55]. In the following comparison with the experimental data, we therefore limit ourselves to a rather brief presentation of a few agglomerated measures.

In order to condense the responses by the individual participating groups presented in Section 4.3, we only consider the reported P50 values for the expected means and standard deviations. The means will be plotted as individual data points, together with their median and the median of the expected standard deviations. Concerning the experimental data, the results from the individual runs are plotted, together with their mean and standard deviation.

In Figure 30, we consider first with measurable 1 the expected and observed maximum pressures in the two sensors. Like predicted by most of the participating groups, the injection of CO_2 had almost no impact on the pressure observed in the two sensors. The reported measured experimental values correspond to the maximum atmospheric pressure during a respective experimental run plus the hydrostatic contribution by the corresponding overlying water column. The individually reported expected means are within 10 mbar of the experimental mean and the median of the expected means shows a very good agreement with the experimental mean. Nevertheless, as already noticed in Section 4.3.1, the participants expected almost no variation in the experimental results. Due to the natural fluctuations in atmospheric pressure, the observed variations turn out to be significantly larger than the expected ones.

Figure 31 illustrates the comparison for the measurables 2 and 5, namely, the time of maximum mobile gas phase in Box A and the time when M(t)



Fig. 30 Comparison of the sparse data reported by the participating groups with the experimental data for measurable 1. Concerning the modeling results, colored circles correspond to the individual expected means, while the horizontal brown line depicts their median. A dashed vertical brown line extends from this value by \pm the median of all reported P50 values for the standard deviation. Some outlier values might be outside the plotting range. Regarding the experimental data, black circles depict the results of the individual runs, while the horizontal black line indicates their mean. A dashed vertical black line extends from the mean by \pm the standard deviation.

exceeds 110% of Box C's width, respectively. Concerning the former, it can be



Fig. 31 Comparison of the sparse data reported by the participating groups with the experimental data for measurables 2 (left) and 5 (right). See Figure 30 for more details on the plotted quantities.

observed that the experimental mean is overestimated by most participating groups and that the reported and observed ranges are rather disjoint. For the latter, the situation is different as two sets of experimental data are provided which differ in the underlying image analysis parameters and constitute upper and lower bounds for the target quantity. Here, the median of the expected means lies close to the corresponding upper experimental mean.

Next, we perform a comparison for the sparse data measurables 3a, 3c, 4a and 4c, regarding the phase distribution of CO_2 after 72 h in Box A and B, respectively. Figure 32 depicts the corresponding quantities in terms of CO_2 mass in either gaseous or liquid phase. Starting with 3a, it can be observed



Fig. 32 Comparison of the sparse data reported by the participating groups with the experimental data for measurables 3a, 3c, 4a and 4c (left to right). See Figure 30 for more details on the plotted quantities.

that the mean value of mobile gaseous CO_2 in Box A is overestimated by most participating groups and only some groups report values within the observed experimental range. This is consistent with the visual impressions discussed in Section 5.1. Regarding 3c, the mean value of CO_2 dissolved in water in Box A is rather underestimated by the modelers. Moving to Box B, all experimental runs suggest that no gaseous CO_2 is left after 72 h. This has also been expected by most participants, while they nevertheless presumed a slight standard deviation on average. While the reported numbers for the expected mean of dissolved CO_2 are rather widespread, the median value is remarkably close to the observed experimental mean.

With the final measurable 6, we examine the total CO_2 mass in top seal facies within Box A at final simulation time, as illustrated in Figure 33. The



Fig. 33 Comparison of the sparse data reported by the participating groups with the experimental data for measurable 6. See Figure 30 for more details on the plotted quantities.

median of the expected means is at around 50% of the observed experimental mean. Correspondingly, most participating groups underestimate the amount of CO₂ in the top seal facies. Nevertheless, two groups are very close to the experimental results.

6 Conclusion and Outlook

In the following, we will draw several conclusions from this validation benchmark study and present challenges and opportunities for further work.

First, we can state with strong confidence that Darcy-scale balance equations together with standard constitutive relationships for the capillary pressure and relative permeability describe adequately the relevant observed physical processes on the considered spatial and temporal scale. This is revealed clearly from the comparison of the modeled saturation and concentration distributions with the corresponding experimental segmentation maps. In particular, stratigraphic and residual trapping mechanisms are captured well by most participating groups. Moreover, the process of convective mixing due to density differences is considered adequately in a qualitative manner.

Quantitatively, large variations in the modeling results can be observed particularly for the dissolution behavior and the resulting fingering. This can be attributed to different modeling choices for the solubility limit of CO_2 in water as well as for constitutive relations such as capillary pressure - saturation relationships, equations of state for determining phase compositions or phase density calculations. It can also be observed that differences in grid resolution clearly influence the convective mixing behavior. Nevertheless, several participating groups are in close proximity to the experimental results, as quantified by the Wasserstein metric. The corresponding distances decrease with increasing time as more CO_2 is dissolved and its mass equilibrates over the domain.

The study included reporting of pre-defined "sparse data", which were quantities that we can consider as proxies for various aspects of storage capacity and storage security. These quantities were reported with both a most likely exceedance value (P50), as well as P10-P90 intervals. While the P50 values mostly reproduce the reported dense data, the P10-P90 values add an additional dimension to the results. Notably, for the majority of requested quantities, the reported P10-P90 quantities do not overlap between the groups. Logically speaking, if two P10-P90 intervals do not overlap, then one group believes that there is at most a 10% chance that the other group will find the experimental results to be within their reported interval (and conversely). This implies that despite the significant group interaction through the study, the groups did not take the quantitative response of other groups into serious consideration, and placed high or full confidence in their own results. This observation is complemented by the fact that the interaction helped very well almost all groups to establish a common understanding regarding the expected qualitative behavior such as the effect of capillary barriers.

A particular critical physical process that is evidenced in this study (both in sparse and dense data) is the role of convective mixing in accelerating dissolution of gaseous CO_2 . This is quantified both through the actual phase compositions in Box A and B, as well as in the metric M, which is a proxy for the time of fully developed fingers (for a detailed discussion of various onset times in numerical simulation of density driven fingers, see [56]. The onset

and evolution of convective fingers is particularly challenging for this system, since the low-order numerical methods used in this study (suitable to capture heterogeneity and stable discretization of multi-phase flow) tend to be too diffusive in their representation of the gas-water interface. The result is significantly over-estimating mass transfer from the gas to the water phase, necessitating a fine grid in the vertical direction. Moreover, the characteristic wave-length of density driven fingers for this system is on the order of 5 cm (as seen experimentally), requiring further necessitating a sub-centimeter grid resolution horizontally. Seen together, this may be the cause for large variability in the reported structure and importance of density-driven fingering among the participants, and motivates further study on how to reliably and accurately capture this process within reservoir simulation tools.

While this study is at the laboratory scale, the fundamental physical processes of multi-phase, multi-component flows in heterogeneous porous media are the same as at reservoir conditions. As such, we argue that the findings and observations in this study are indicative of field-scale simulation (for a detailed scaling analysis, see Kovscek et al, this volume). That said, actual field-scale simulation will deviate from this study in several important aspects, of which we highlight:

- Heterogeneity. This study was conducted with homogeneous facies (to the extent possible in laboratory conditions), emphasizing larger scale structural heterogenities. On the field scale, it is expected that there will be significant subscale heterogeneity also within each geological stucture.
- Quality of geological characterization. This study was conducted in a quasi-2D geometry, which was fairly well characterized (high-resolution photography as well as thickness measurements at the beginning of the experiment). At the field scale, the geological characterization is based on seismic surveys, which are not able to provide the same level of accuracy.
- Dimensionality. Reality is 3D, which will impact simulation time, and thus indirectly the level of grid refinement that can be sought.
- Convective mixing. In field-scale simulations, the spatial and temporal resolutions required for capturing correctly convective mixing are not practically feasible.
- Pressure and temperature conditions. At laboratory conditions CO₂ exists in a gas phase, while at field scale typically reservoirs with pressure and temperature compatible with supercritical CO₂ is sought. This has a minor impact on viscosity, but leads to a denser and less compressible CO₂ phase.

What actually is very different from reservior conditions at depth is the importance of pressure measurements. In the experiment, pressure signals are rather uninformative and might introduce differences in permeability interpretation, whereas they are valuable in a reservoir context. Another major consideration is that the subsurface is much harder to characterize than the experimental rig, and so the uncertainties in predictions are going to dominated by uncertainties in geological characterisation. This code comparison illustrates the range of predictions that are possible in a relatively well-characterised system.

From a reservoir simulation perspective, all participants reported that they struggled to achieve acceptable run times, and were forced to use relatively coarse grids for this study. We speculate that this is due to the low density of the gas phase, which has the consequence that when CO_2 dissolves into water, the resulting mixture has significantly lower volume than before mixing. This study thus provides impetus for further development of efficient non-linear solvers for soluble gas-water systems.

Acknowledgments. B. Flemisch thanks the German Research Foundation (DFG) for supporting this work by funding SFB 1313, Project Number 327154368. S. Geiger acknowledges partial funding from Energi Simulation. H. Hajibeygi was sponsored by the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO) under Vidi Talent Program Project "ADMIRE" (Project Number 17509).

References

- Bachu, S., Bonijoly, D., Bradshaw, J., Burruss, R., Holloway, S., Christensen, N.P., Mathiassen, O.M.: CO₂ storage capacity estimation: Methodology and gaps. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control 1(4), 430–443 (2007). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1750-5836(07)00086-2
- Pacala, S., Socolow, R.: Stabilization wedges: Solving the climate problem for the next 50 years with current technologies. Science 305(5686), 968– 972 (2004). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1100103
- [3] Halland, E.K., Riis, F., Magnus, C., Johansen, W.T., Tappel, I.M., Gjeldvik, I.T., Solbakk, T., Pham, V.T.H.: CO₂ storage atlas of the norwegian part of the north sea. Energy Procedia 37, 4919–4926 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2013.06.403
- [4] Metz, B., Davidson, O., De Coninck, H., Loos, M., Meyer, L.: IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2005)
- [5] Johnson, N., Parker, N., Ogden, J.: How negative can biofuels with CCS take us and at what cost? Refining the economic potential of biofuel production with CCS using spatially-explicit modeling. Energy Procedia 63, 6770–6791 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.712
- [6] Noussan, M., Raimondi, P.P., Scita, R., Hafner, M.: The role of green and blue hydrogen in the energy transition – a technological and geopolitical perspective. Sustainability 13(1) (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/ su13010298

- [7] Juanes, R., MacMinn, C.W., Szulczewski, M.L.: The footprint of the CO₂ plume during carbon dioxide storage in saline aquifers: Storage efficiency for capillary trapping at the basin scale. Transport in Porous Media 82(1), 19–30 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11242-009-9420-3
- [8] Lindeberg, E., Vuillaume, J.-F., Ghaderi, A.: Determination of the CO₂ storage capacity of the Utsira formation. Energy Procedia 1(1), 2777–2784 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2009.02.049
- [9] Kopp, A., Class, H., Helmig, R.: Investigations on CO₂ storage capacity in saline aquifers: Part 1. Dimensional analysis of flow processes and reservoir characteristics. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control 3(3), 263–276 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.10.002
- [10] Kopp, A., Class, H., Helmig, R.: Investigations on CO₂ storage capacity in saline aquifers – Part 2: Estimation of storage capacity coefficients. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control 3(3), 277–287 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.10.001
- [11] Niemi, A., Bensabat, J., Shtivelman, V., Edlmann, K., Gouze, P., Luquot, L., Hingerl, F., Benson, S.M., Pezard, P.A., Rasmusson, K., Liang, T., Fagerlund, F., Gendler, M., Goldberg, I., Tatomir, A., Lange, T., Sauter, M., Freifeld, B.: Heletz experimental site overview, characterization and data analysis for CO₂ injection and geological storage. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control 48, 3–23 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.ijggc.2015.12.030
- [12] Sharma, S., Cook, P., Jenkins, C., Steeper, T., Lees, M., Ranasinghe, N.: The CO2CRC Otway project: Leveraging experience and exploiting new opportunities at Australia's first CCS project site. Energy Procedia 4, 5447–5454 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2011.02.530
- [13] Scheer, D., Class, H., Flemisch, B.: Subsurface Environmental Modelling Between Science and Policy. Springer, Cham (2021)
- [14] Steyn, M., Oglesby, J., Turan, G., Zapantis, A., Gebremedhin, R., Zapantis, A., Amer, N.A., Havercroft, I., Ivory-Moore, R., Steyn, M., Yang, X., Gebremedhin, R., Zahra, M.A., Pinto, E., Rassool, D., Williams, E., Consoli, C., Minervini, J.: Global Status of CCS 2022 (2022). https://status22.globalccsinstitute.com/wp-content/ uploads/2022/11/Global-Status-of-CCS-2022_Download.pdf
- [15] Preston, C., Monea, M., Jazrawi, W., Brown, K., Whittaker, S., White, D., Law, D., Chalaturnyk, R., Rostron, B.: IEA GHG Weyburn CO₂ monitoring and storage project. Fuel Processing Technology 86(14), 1547– 1568 (2005). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2005.01.019

- [16] Lüth, S., Henninges, J., Ivandic, M., Juhlin, C., Kempka, T., Norden, B., Rippe, D., Schmidt-Hattenberger, C.: Chapter 6.2 - Geophysical monitoring of the injection and postclosure phases at the Ketzin pilot site. In: Kasahara, J., Zhdanov, M.S., Mikada, H. (eds.) Active Geophysical Monitoring, 2nd edn., pp. 523–561. Elsevier, Amsterdam (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102684-7.00025-X
- [17] Pruess, K., Garciia, J., Kovscek, T., Oldenburg, C., Rutqvist, J., Steefel, C., Xu, T.: Code intercomparison builds confidence in numerical simulation models for geologic disposal of CO₂. Energy **29**(9–10), 1431–1444 (2004). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2004.03.077
- [18] Class, H., Ebigbo, A., Helmig, R., Dahle, H.K., Nordbotten, J.M., Celia, M.A., Audigane, P., Darcis, M., Ennis-King, J., Fan, Y., Flemisch, B., Gasda, S.E., Jin, M., Krug, S., Labregere, D., Naderi Beni, A., Pawar, R.J., Sbai, A., Thomas, S.G., Trenty, L., Wei, L.: A benchmark study on problems related to CO₂ storage in geologic formations. Computational Geosciences **13**(4), 409–434 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10596-009-9146-x
- [19] Nordbotten, J.M., Flemisch, B., Gasda, S.E., Nilsen, H.M., Fan, Y., Pickup, G.E., Wiese, B., Celia, M.A., Dahle, H.K., Eigestad, G.T., Pruess, K.: Uncertainties in practical simulation of CO₂ storage. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control 9, 234–242 (2012). https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.03.007
- [20] Oberkampf, W.L., Roy, C.J.: Verification and Validation in Scientific Computing. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2010)
- [21] American Society of Mechanical Engineers: Guide for Verification and Validation in Computational Solid Mechanics: an American National Standard. ASME Press, New York (2006). https://www.asme.org/products/ codes-standards/v-v-10-2006-guide-verification-validation
- [22] Oberkampf, W.L., Trucano, T.G.: Verification and validation benchmarks. Nuclear Engineering and Design 238(3), 716–743 (2008). https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.nucengdes.2007.02.032
- [23] Nordbotten, J.M., Fernø, M., Flemisch, B., Juanes, R., Jørgensen, M.: Final Benchmark Description: FluidFlower International Benchmark Study. (2022). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6807102
- [24] Fernø, M.A., Haugen, M., Eikehaug, K., Folkvord, O., Benali, B., Nordbotten, J.M.: Meter-scale CO₂ injection experiments and data set. Transport in Porous Media, this S.I. (2023)
- [25] Peng, D.-Y., Robinson, D.B.: A new two-constant equation of state.

Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals 15(1), 59–64 (1976). https://doi.org/10.1021/i160057a011

- [26] Spycher, N., Pruess, K., Ennis-King, J.: CO₂-H₂O mixtures in the geological sequestration of CO₂. I. Assessment and calculation of mutual solubilities from 12 to 100°C and up to 600 bar. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 67(16), 3015–3031 (2003). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7037(03) 00273-4
- [27] Spycher, N., Pruess, K.: CO₂-H₂O mixtures in the geological sequestration of CO₂. II. Partitioning in chloride brines at 12–100°C and up to 600 bar. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 69(13), 3309–3320 (2005). https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2005.01.015
- [28] Ziabakhsh-Ganji, Z., Kooi, H.: An equation of state for thermodynamic equilibrium of gas mixtures and brines to allow simulation of the effects of impurities in subsurface CO₂ storage. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control 11, 21–34 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2012. 07.025
- [29] Duan, Z., Sun, R.: An improved model calculating CO₂ solubility in pure water and aqueous NaCl solutions from 273 to 533 K and from 0 to 2000 bar. Chemical Geology **193**(3), 257–271 (2003). https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0009-2541(02)00263-2
- [30] Span, R., Wagner, W.: A new equation of state for carbon dioxide covering the fluid region from the triple-point temperature to 1100 K at pressures up to 800 MPa. J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 25, 1509–1596 (1996). https: //doi.org/10.1063/1.555991
- [31] Span, R., Wagner, W.: Equations of State for Technical Applications.
 I. Simultaneously Optimized Functional Forms for Nonpolar and Polar Fluids. International Journal of Thermophysics 24(1), 1–39 (2003). https: //doi.org/10.1023/A:1022390430888
- [32] Weiss, R.F.: Carbon dioxide in water and seawater: the solubility of a non-ideal gas. Marine Chemistry 2(3), 203–215 (1974). https://doi.org/ 10.1016/0304-4203(74)90015-2
- [33] Sandve, T.H., Gasda, S.E., Rasmussen, A., Rustad, A.B.: Convective dissolution in field scale CO₂ storage simulations using the OPM flow simulator. In: TCCS-11. CO₂ Capture, Transport and Storage. Trondheim 22nd-23rd June 2021 Short Papers from the 11th International Trondheim CCS Conference (2021). SINTEF Academic Press
- [34] IAPWS: Revised Release on the IAPWS Industrial Formulation 1997 for the Thermodynamic Properties of Water and Steam. Technical report,

IAPWS (2007). www.iapws.org/relguide/IF97-Rev.pdf

- [35] Garcia, J.E.: Density of aqueous solutions of CO₂. Technical Report LBNL-49023, LBNL (2001)
- [36] Soave, G.: Equilibrium constants from a modified redlich-kwong equation of state. Chemical Engineering Science 27(6), 1197–1203 (1972). https: //doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(72)80096-4
- [37] Carroll, J.J., Slupsky, J.D., Mather, A.E.: The solubility of carbon dioxide in water at low pressure. Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data 20(6), 1201–1209 (1991). https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555900
- [38] Fenghour, A., Wakeham, W.A., Vesovic, V.: The viscosity of carbon dioxide. Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data 27(1), 31–44 (1998). https://doi.org/10.1063/1.556013
- [39] Wilkins, A., Green, C.P., Ennis-King, J.: An open-source multiphysics simulation code for coupled problems in porous media. Computers & Geosciences 154, 104820 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cageo.2021. 104820
- [40] Wang, Y., Vuik, C., Hajibeygi, H.: Analysis of hydrodynamic trapping interactions during full-cycle injection and migration of CO₂ in deep saline aquifers. Advances in Water Resources 159, 104073 (2022). https://doi. org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2021.104073
- [41] Lyu, X., Khait, M., Voskov, D.: Operator-based linearization approach for modeling of multiphase flow with buoyancy and capillarity. SPE Journal 26(4), 1858–1878 (2021). https://doi.org/10.2118/205378-PA
- [42] Lie, K.-A.: An Introduction to Reservoir Simulation Using MAT-LAB/GNU Octave: User Guide for the MATLAB Reservoir Simulation Toolbox (MRST). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2019). https: //doi.org/10.1017/9781108591416
- [43] Zyvoloski, G.A., Robinson, B.A., Dash, Z.V., Trease, L.L.: Summary of the models and methods for the FEHM application - a finite-element heatand mass-transfer code. OSTI (1997). https://doi.org/10.2172/14903
- [44] Lichtner, P.C., Hammond, G.E., Lu, C., Karra, S., Bisht, G., Andre, B., Mills, R., Kumar, J.: PFLOTRAN user manual: A massively parallel reactive flow and transport model for describing surface and subsurface processes. OSTI (2015). https://doi.org/10.2172/1168703
- [45] Matthäi, S., Geiger, S., Roberts, S.: Complex systems platform: Csp3d3.0: user's guide. Technical report, ETH Zurich (2001)

- 40 The FluidFlower International Benchmark Study
- [46] Zhou, Y., Jiang, Y., Tchelepi, H.A.: A scalable multistage linear solver for reservoir models with multisegment wells. Computational Geosciences 17(2), 197–216 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10596-012-9324-0
- [47] Garipov, T.T., Tomin, P., Rin, R., Voskov, D.V., Tchelepi, H.A.: Unified thermo-compositional-mechanical framework for reservoir simulation. Computational Geosciences 22(4), 1039–1057 (2018). https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10596-018-9737-5
- [48] Zhou, Y.: Parallel general-purpose reservoir simulation with coupled reservoir models and multisegment wells. PhD thesis, Stanford University (2012)
- [49] Younis, R., Tchelepi, H.A., Aziz, K.: Adaptively localized continuation-Newton method—nonlinear solvers that converge all the time. SPE Journal 15(02), 526–544 (2010). https://doi.org/10.2118/119147-PA
- [50] Koch, T., Glaeser, D., Weishaupt, K., Ackermann, S., Beck, M., Becker, B., Burbulla, S., Class, H., Coltman, E., Emmert, S., Fetzer, T., Grueninger, C., Heck, K., Hommel, J., Kurz, T., Lipp, M., Mohammadi, F., Scherrer, S., Schneider, M., Seitz, G., Stadler, L., Utz, M., Weinhardt, F., Flemisch, B.: DuMux 3 – an open-source simulator for solving flow and transport problems in porous media with a focus on model coupling. Computers & Mathematics with Applications 81, 423–443 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2020.02.012
- [51] Panaretos, V.M., Zemel, Y.: Statistical aspects of Wasserstein distances. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application 6(1), 405–431 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-030718-104938
- [52] Flamary, R., Courty, N., Gramfort, A., Alaya, M.Z., Boisbunon, A., Chambon, S., Chapel, L., Corenflos, A., Fatras, K., Fournier, N., Gautheron, L., Gayraud, N.T.H., Janati, H., Rakotomamonjy, A., Redko, I., Rolet, A., Schutz, A., Seguy, V., Sutherland, D.J., Tavenard, R., Tong, A., Vayer, T.: POT: Python optimal transport. Journal of Machine Learning Research 22(78), 1–8 (2021)
- [53] Youssef, A.A., Shao, Q., Matthäi, S.K.: Simplified numeric simulation approach for CO₂, g-water flow and trapping at near-surface conditions. Transport in Porous Media, this S.I. (2023)
- [54] Nordbotten, J.M., Benali, B., Both, J.W., Brattekås, B., Storvik, E., Fernø, M.: Two-scale image processing for porous media. Transport in Porous Media, this S.I. (2023)
- [55] Nordbotten, J.M., Jørgensen, M., Fernø, M., Flemisch, B., Juanes, R.:

Over confidence bias for predicting geological carbon storage. In preparation $\left(2023\right)$

[56] Elenius, M.T., Johannsen, K.: On the time scales of nonlinear instability in miscible displacement porous media flow. Computational Geosciences 16(4), 901–911 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10596-012-9294-2

Statements and Declarations

Funding

S. Geiger acknowledges partial funding from Energi Simulation. H. Hajibeygi was sponsored by the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO) under Vidi Talent Program Project "ADMIRE" (Project Number 17509).

Competing interests

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Author Contributions

B. Flemisch, J. Nordbotten, M. Fernø and R. Juanes conceptualized, designed and implemented the benchmark study. All other authors constitute the participating groups and correspondingly set up, executed and evaluated the simulations and provided the requested results, together with descriptions of the underlying models. B. Flemisch and J. Nordbotten wrote the initial draft of the manuscript, all other authors were involved in the internal review and editing process. B. Flemisch wrote and executed the scripts for generating all figures in the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data Availability

All data which has been used for generating the figures in this paper is collected in respective repositories of the GitHub "FluidFlower" organization, which is accessible at github.com/fluidflower. In particular, the results provided by the participating groups are collected in repositories github. com/fluidflower/groupname.git, where groupname is out of austin, csiro, delft, heriot-watt, lanl, melbourne, stanford and stuttgart. The experimental data used for comparison with the modeling results is assembled in github.com/fluidflower/experiment. The scripts for the generation of all figures are contained in github.com/fluidflower/general.

Appendix A Wasserstein distances

The following tables list the Wasserstein distances between the spatial maps as provided by the participating groups for each requested timestep. For the calculation, the Python library POT [52] has been used. The full data including

distances between results from different timesteps is provided in the FluidFlower general GitHub repository. For obtaining the numbers depicted in Figure 12, the normalized table values of dimension meter were multiplied by $850\,{\rm g\,cm\,m^{-1}}$ to arrive at the desired dimension of gram times centimeter. The value 8.5 refers to the mass of injected CO_2 in gram.

A.124 hours

dist [m]	Austin	CSIRO	DARSim	DARTS	LANL	Melbourne	Stanford	Stuttgart
Austin CSIRO DARSim DARTS LANL Melbourne Stanford Stuttgart	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.97e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 7.62e-2\\ 1.01e-1\\ 5.27e-1\\ 1.18e-1\\ 4.93e-1\\ 3.71e-2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 2.25e-1\\ 7.62e-2\\ 0.00e0\\ 1.52e-1\\ 5.00e-1\\ 1.13e-1\\ 5.23e-1\\ 8.81e-2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 1.39\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.01\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.52\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 0.00\mathrm{e}0 \\ 5.91\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.40\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 4.28\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.18\mathrm{e} - 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} 7.12e - 1 \\ 5.27e - 1 \\ 5.00e - 1 \\ 5.91e - 1 \\ 0.00e0 \\ 4.85e - 1 \\ 1.02e0 \\ 5.33e - 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.50\mathrm{e} - 1\\ 1.18\mathrm{e} - 1\\ 1.13\mathrm{e} - 1\\ 1.40\mathrm{e} - 1\\ 4.85\mathrm{e} - 1\\ 0.00\mathrm{e} 0\\ 5.35\mathrm{e} - 1\\ 1.51\mathrm{e} - 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.19e-1\\ 4.93e-1\\ 5.23e-1\\ 4.28e-1\\ 1.02e0\\ 5.35e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 4.90e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.87e-1\\ 3.71e-2\\ 8.81e-2\\ 1.18e-1\\ 5.33e-1\\ 1.51e-1\\ 4.90e-1\\ 0.00e0 \end{array}$

A.248 hours

dist [m]	Austin	CSIRO	DARSim	DARTS	LANL	Melbourne	Stanford	Stuttgart
Austin CSIRO DARSim DARTS LANL Melbourne	$\begin{array}{c} 0.00e0\\ 1.58e-1\\ 1.94e-1\\ 1.46e-1\\ 6.47e-1\\ 2.02e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.58e - 1 \\ 0.00e0 \\ 8.94e - 2 \\ 6.62e - 2 \\ 4.99e - 1 \\ 9.40e - 2 \end{array}$	$1.94e - 1 \\ 8.94e - 2 \\ 0.00e0 \\ 1.17e - 1 \\ 4.60e - 1 \\ 9.46e - 2 \\$	1.46e - 1 6.62e - 2 1.17e - 1 0.00e0 5.08e - 1 1.13e - 1	6.47e - 1 4.99e - 1 4.60e - 1 5.08e - 1 0.00e0 4.58e - 1	$\begin{array}{c} 2.02e-1\\ 9.40e-2\\ 9.46e-2\\ 1.13e-1\\ 4.58e-1\\ 0.00e0 \end{array}$	3.39e - 1 4.52e - 1 4.92e - 1 4.43e - 1 9.49e - 1 4.92e - 1	$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$
Stanford Stuttgart	3.39e - 1 2.32e - 1	4.52e - 1 9.45e - 2	4.92e - 1 1.13e - 1	4.43e - 1 1.12e - 1	9.49e - 1 4.20e - 1	4.92e - 1 1.36e - 1	0.00e0 5.35e - 1	5.35e - 1 0.00e0

A.3 72 hours

dist [m]	Austin	CSIRO	DARSim	DARTS	LANL	Melbourne	Stanford	Stuttgart
Austin CSIRO DARSim DARTS LANL Melbourne Stanford Stuttgart		$\begin{array}{c} 1.15e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 1.32e-1\\ 8.68e-2\\ 5.64e-1\\ 7.48e-2\\ 3.60e-1\\ 1.70e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.59e - 1 \\ 1.32e - 1 \\ 0.00e0 \\ 1.32e - 1 \\ 4.83e - 1 \\ 9.89e - 2 \\ 4.37e - 1 \\ 1.46e - 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 1.43e-1\\ 8.68e-2\\ 1.32e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 5.06e-1\\ 8.39e-2\\ 4.14e-1\\ 1.21e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.33e-1\\ 5.64e-1\\ 4.83e-1\\ 5.06e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 5.28e-1\\ 9.19e-1\\ 3.97e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.41e-1\\ 7.48e-2\\ 9.89e-2\\ 8.39e-2\\ 5.28e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 3.92e-1\\ 1.64e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.22e-1\\ 3.60e-1\\ 4.37e-1\\ 9.19e-1\\ 3.92e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 5.26e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.40\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.70\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.46\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.21\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 3.97\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 1.64\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 5.26\mathrm{e} - 1 \\ 0.00\mathrm{e} 0 \end{array}$

A.4 96 hours

dist [m]	Austin	CSIRO	DARSim	DARTS	LANL	Melbourne	Stanford	Stuttgart
Austin CSIRO DARSim DARTS LANL Melbourne Stanford Stuttgart		$\begin{array}{c} 1.08e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 1.59e-1\\ 9.81e-2\\ 6.10e-1\\ 6.81e-2\\ 3.33e-1\\ 2.25e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.37e-1\\ 1.59e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 1.45e-1\\ 4.86e-1\\ 1.15e-1\\ 4.00e-1\\ 1.50e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 1.33e-1\\ 9.81e-2\\ 1.45e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 5.27e-1\\ 7.38e-2\\ 3.61e-1\\ 1.43e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.14e - 1 \\ 6.10e - 1 \\ 4.86e - 1 \\ 5.27e - 1 \\ 0.00e0 \\ 5.74e - 1 \\ 8.86e - 1 \\ 3.87e - 1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.10e-1\\ 6.81e-2\\ 1.15e-1\\ 7.38e-2\\ 5.74e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 3.14e-1\\ 1.96e-1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.12e-1\\ 3.33e-1\\ 4.00e-1\\ 3.61e-1\\ 8.86e-1\\ 3.14e-1\\ 0.00e0\\ 5.01e-1 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$

A.5 120 hours

dist [m]	Austin	CSIRO	DARSim	DARTS	LANL	Melbourne	Stanford	Stuttgart	
Austin	0.00e0	1.25e - 1	1.25e - 1	1.24e - 1	5.91e - 1	1.03e - 1	3.05e - 1	2.00e - 1	
CSIRO	1.25e - 1	0.00e0	1.69e - 1	8.21e - 2	6.27e - 1	7.59e - 2	3.27e - 1	2.35e - 1	
DARSim	1.25e - 1	1.69e - 1	0.00e0	1.57e - 1	4.85e - 1	1.30e - 1	3.69e - 1	1.39e - 1	
DARTS	1.24e - 1	8.21e - 2	1.57e - 1	0.00e0	5.57e - 1	7.54e - 2	3.36e - 1	1.66e - 1	
LANL	5.91e - 1	6.27e - 1	4.85e - 1	5.57e - 1	0.00e0	6.03e - 1	8.54e - 1	3.92e - 1	
Melbourne	1.03e - 1	7.59e - 2	1.30e - 1	7.54e - 2	6.03e - 1	0.00e0	2.71e - 1	2.14e - 1	
Stanford	3.05e - 1	3.27e - 1	3.69e - 1	3.36e - 1	8.54e - 1	2.71e - 1	0.00e0	4.64e - 1	
Stuttgart	2.00e - 1	2.35e - 1	1.39e - 1	1.66e - 1	3.92e - 1	2.14e - 1	4.64e - 1	0.00e0	
							•		

Appendix B Sparse data provided by the participants

The following tables present the sparse data as provided by the participants. The values $P_{10}(\bar{x})$, $P_{50}(\bar{x})$ and $P_{90}(\bar{x})$ indicate the P10, P50 and P90 values of the expected mean of the respective quantity, whereas $P_{10}(\sigma)$, $P_{50}(\sigma)$ and $P_{90}(\sigma)$ refer to the correspondingly expected standard deviation. The values are also contained in the respective participant repositories.

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.11e5	1.11e5	1.13e5	9.21e2	9.08e2	1.47e3
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.05e5	1.05e5	1.06e5	4.34e2	4.14e2	7.75e2
2 [s]	1.86e4	1.86e4	1.86e4	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
3a [kg]	1.70e - 3	1.82e - 3	2.11e - 3	2.08e - 4	1.49e - 4	2.93e - 4
3b [kg]	2.96e - 4	3.15e - 4	3.45e - 4	2.96e - 5	2.04e-5	3.45e - 5
3c [kg]	1.15e - 3	1.51e - 3	1.99e - 3	4.72e - 4	2.96e - 4	5.53e - 4
3d [kg]	8.37e - 5	1.36e - 4	3.31e - 4	1.35e - 4	1.12e - 4	1.99e - 4
4a [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
4b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
4c [kg]	1.20e - 6	4.44e - 5	2.51e - 4	1.39e - 4	1.21e - 4	2.10e - 4
4d [kg]	1.56e - 12	7.85e - 8	6.50e - 6	3.32e - 6	3.29e-6	5.98e - 6
5 [s]	1.35e4	1.62e4	1.80e4	2.83e3	1.63e3	2.68e3
6 [kg]	8.49e - 5	1.58e - 4	3.37e - 4	1.42e - 4	1.09e-4	1.92e - 4

B.1 Austin

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.11e5	1.11e5	1.11e5	6.10e0	8.32e0	1.05e1
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.06e5	1.06e5	1.06e5	$3.53\mathrm{e}0$	5.75e0	7.98e0
2 [s]	1.80e4	1.80e4	1.80e4	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
3a [kg]	1.67 e - 4	3.49e - 4	8.33e - 4	2.89e - 4	3.90e - 4	4.91e - 4
3b [kg]	0.00e0	2.80e - 7	1.11e - 5	3.97e - 6	5.35e - 6	6.74e - 6
3c [kg]	2.95e - 3	3.60e - 3	4.08e - 3	4.11e - 4	5.54e - 4	6.97e - 4
3d [kg]	5.32e - 4	5.69e - 4	6.06e - 4	2.23e - 5	3.04e - 5	3.85e - 5
4a [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
4b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
4c [kg]	1.42e - 4	2.98e - 4	5.42e - 4	1.46e - 4	1.97e - 4	2.48e - 4
4d [kg]	2.82e - 7	1.03e-7	3.43e - 7	9.78e - 7	1.34e - 6	1.69e - 6
5 [s]	6.11e4	8.33e4	1.28e5	2.61e4	3.52e4	4.42e4
6 [kg]	5.33e - 4	5.72e - 4	6.61e - 4	5.38e - 5	7.34e-5	9.31e - 5

B.2 CSIRO

B.3 Delft-DARSim

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.10e5	1.10e5	1.10e5	1.92e0	1.92e0	1.92e0
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.04e5	1.04e5	1.04e5	3.90e0	3.90e0	3.90e0
2 [s]	1.38e4	1.41e4	1.74e4	1.68e3	1.68e3	1.68e3
3a [kg]	0.00e0	7.61e - 4	1.71e - 3	7.12e - 4	7.12e - 4	7.12e - 4
3b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	1.44e - 5	7.85e-6	7.85e-6	7.85e - 6
3c [kg]	1.12e - 3	2.20e - 3	3.29e - 3	9.06e - 4	9.06e - 4	9.06e - 4
3d [kg]	3.88e - 6	6.68e - 6	1.84e - 5	6.59e - 6	6.59e - 6	6.59e - 6
4a [kg]	8.05e - 10	2.43e - 9	1.31e - 5	$6.67 \mathrm{e} - 6$	$6.67 \mathrm{e} - 6$	6.67 e - 6
4b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
4c [kg]	4.29e - 4	6.26e - 4	8.37e - 4	1.80e - 4	1.80e - 4	1.80e - 4
4d [kg]	3.38e - 9	1.33e - 8	1.44e-7	7.46e - 8	7.46e - 8	7.46e - 8
5 [s]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
6 [kg]	6.68e - 6	1.20e - 5	2.65e-5	8.92e-6	8.92e-6	8.92e - 6

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.11e5	1.11e5	1.11e5	5.45e1	5.45e1	5.45e1
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.05e5	1.05e5	1.05e5	3.91e1	3.91e1	3.91e1
2 [s]	1.62e4	1.74e4	1.80e4	6.64e2	6.64e2	6.64e2
3a [kg]	2.29e - 4	1.15e - 3	1.93e - 3	6.27 e - 4	$6.27 \mathrm{e} - 4$	6.27e - 4
3b [kg]	1.90e - 5	8.30e - 5	1.40e - 4	4.40e - 5	4.40e - 5	4.40e - 5
3c [kg]	1.38e - 3	2.32e - 3	3.55e - 3	8.02e - 4	8.02e - 4	8.02e - 4
3d [kg]	1.29e - 4	3.98e - 4	6.57e - 4	2.13e - 4	2.13e - 4	2.13e - 4
4a [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6
4b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
4c [kg]	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 5	4.60e - 5	2.90e - 5	2.90e - 5	2.90e - 5
4d [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6
5 [s]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0
6 [kg]	2.14e - 4	5.20e - 4	6.58e - 4	1.75e - 4	1.75e-4	1.75e - 4

B.4 Delft-DARTS

B.5 Heriot-Watt

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$\frac{1a [N/m^2]}{1b [N/m^2]}$	1.10e5	1.10e5	1.10e5	2.00e1	2.00e1	2.00e1
	1.04e5	1.04e5	1.04e5	2.00e1	2.00e1	2.00e1
2 [s]	1.80e4	1.80e4	1.90e4	6.00e2	6.00e2	6.00e2
3a [kg]	0.00e0	1.00e - 3	1.80e - 3	5.00e - 4	5.00e - 4	5.00e - 4
3b [kg]	0.00e0	1.00e - 4	3.00e - 4	1.00e - 4	1.00e - 4	1.00e - 4
3c [kg]	1.00e - 3	2.00e - 3	4.00e - 3	1.00e - 3	1.00e - 3	1.00e - 3
3d [kg]	0.00e0	5.00e - 4	9.00e - 4	3.00e - 4	3.00e - 4	3.00e - 4
4a [kg]	0.00e0	1.00e - 5	1.00e - 4	5.00e - 7	5.00e - 6	5.00e - 5
4b [kg]	0.00e0	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 5	5.00e - 8	5.00e - 7	$5.00e - 6 \\ 5.00e - 4 \\ 5.00e - 6$
4c [kg]	0.00e0	1.00e - 4	1.00e - 3	5.00e - 5	5.00e - 5	
4d [kg]	0.00e0	2.00e - 5	1.00e - 4	5.00e - 6	5.00e - 6	
5 [s] 6 [kg]	6.00e3 0.00e0	$1.00e4 \\ 5.00e - 5$	$1.50e4 \\ 1.00e - 4$	1.00e3 0.00e0	$1.00e3 \\ 1.00e - 5$	1.00e3 1.00e - 4

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.11e5	1.11e5	1.11e5	1.00e0	1.00e0	1.00e0
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.05e5	1.05e5	1.05e5	1.00e0	1.00e0	1.00e0
2 [s]	1.00e11	1.00e9	4.32e5	4.32e5	4.32e5	4.32e5
3a [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	1.00e - 6	5.00e - 7	1.00e - 7
3b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	1.00e - 6	5.00e - 7	1.00e - 7
3c [kg]	7.24e - 5	7.24e - 5	7.24e-5	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6
3d [kg]	5.24e - 5	5.24e - 5	5.24e - 5	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6
4a [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6
4b [kg]	2.37e - 5	2.37e - 5	2.37e-5	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6	1.00e - 6
4c [kg]	1.99e - 3	1.99e - 3	1.99e - 3	1.00e - 4	1.00e - 4	1.00e - 4
4d [kg]	5.77e - 4	5.77e-4	5.77e-4	1.00e - 5	1.00e - 5	1.00e - 5
5 [s]	8.64e6	8.64e6	8.64e6	3.60e3	3.60e3	3.60e3
6 [kg]	1.16e - 4	1.16e - 4	1.16e - 4	1.00e - 5	1.00e-5	1.00e - 5

B.6 LANL

B.7 Melbourne

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$	
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.12e5	1.12e5	1.13e5	3.55e2	2.75e2	3.06e2	
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.05e5	1.05e5	1.06e5	2.36e2	1.88e2	2.79e2	
2 [s]	1.60e4	1.71e4	1.79e4	7.41e1	3.23e2	1.20e2	
3a [kg]	4.02e - 4	5.83e - 4	7.50e - 4	1.83e - 5	3.84e - 5	6.04 e - 5	
3b [kg]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3c [kg]	3.64e - 3	3.88e - 3	4.28e - 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3d [kg]	6.67 e - 4	7.58e - 4	8.57e - 4	$6.67 \mathrm{e} - 4$	7.58e - 4	8.54e - 4	
4a [kg]	3.16e - 17	3.39e - 17	3.81e - 17	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4b [kg]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4c [kg]	1.57e - 3	1.61e - 3	1.62e - 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	
4d [kg]	2.58e - 6	3.81e-6	2.34e - 5	n/a	n/a	n/a	
5 [s]	1.23e4	1.31e4	1.40e4	1.26e2	1.53e2	2.68e2	
6 [kg]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$	
$1a [N/m^2]$	1.11e5	1.11e5	1.12e5	n/a	2.37e1	n/a	
$1b [N/m^2]$	1.05e5	1.06e5	1.06e5	n/a	2.38e1	n/a	
2 [s]	1.82e4	2.66e4	2.31e4	n/a	1.83e3	n/a	
3a [kg]	0.00e0	1.90e - 3	2.26e - 3	n/a	8.57e - 4	n/a	
3b [kg]	1.96e - 4	2.03e - 3	5.89e - 3	n/a	2.93e - 3	n/a	
3c [kg]	1.22e - 3	5.29e - 3	5.64e - 3	n/a	2.06e - 3	n/a	
3d [kg]	1.37e - 3	2.04e - 3	5.99e - 3	n/a	2.70e - 3	n/a	
4a [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	2.23e - 4	n/a	1.66e - 4	n/a	
4b [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	2.70e - 5	n/a	2.01e - 5	n/a	
4c [kg]	7.80e - 6	4.50e - 5	2.15e - 4	n/a	9.52e - 5	n/a	
4d [kg]	0.00e0	0.00e0	0.00e0	n/a	0.00e0	n/a	
5 [s]	n/a	1.35e4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
6 [kg]	1.36e - 3	2.03e - 3	5.98e - 3	n/a	2.70e - 3	n/a	

$\mathbf{B.8}$	Stanford
D .0	Stantoru

B.9 Stuttgart

\mathbf{SRQ}	$P_{10}(\bar{x})$	$P_{50}(\bar{x})$	$P_{90}(\bar{x})$	$P_{10}(\sigma)$	$P_{50}(\sigma)$	$P_{90}(\sigma)$
$1a [N/m^2]$	n/a	1.10e5	n/a	n/a	8.10e0	n/a
$1b [N/m^2]$	n/a	1.04e5	n/a	n/a	6.21e0	n/a
2 [s]	n/a	1.77e4	n/a	n/a	9.43e2	n/a
3a [kg]	n/a	2.00e - 3	n/a	n/a	5.42e - 4	n/a
3b [kg]	n/a	1.01e - 6	n/a	n/a	1.43e - 6	n/a
3c [kg]	n/a	1.60e - 3	n/a	n/a	4.96e - 4	n/a
3d [kg]	n/a	3.20e - 4	n/a	n/a	3.49e - 4	n/a
4a [kg]	n/a	1.79e - 6	n/a	n/a	4.06e - 6	n/a
4b [kg]	n/a	0.00e0	n/a	n/a	0.00e0	n/a
4c [kg]	n/a	3.95e - 4	n/a	n/a	2.55e - 4	n/a
4d [kg]	n/a	9.05e - 6	n/a	n/a	1.23e - 5	n/a
5 [s]	n/a	3.39e4	n/a	n/a	1.38e4	n/a
6 [kg]	n/a	3.57e - 4	n/a	n/a	3.93e - 4	n/a