



## COST ANALYSIS

### FLINDERS #1

#### 36" HOLE SECTION

This section was drilled at a cost of \$9,170.38. This exceeds the programmed cost of \$5,831.90 by 57%, due to the volume of sweeps used and the inclusion of 119 cu.m prepared for use on the next interval. At \$39.23/cu.m, this represents \$4,668.37 (80%). The corrected interval cost was \$4,502.01 (77%) or 23% below programme cost.

#### 17<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" HOLE SECTION

The interval cost \$11,210.56, exceeded the programmed cost \$7,760.73 by \$3,449.83 or 44%. With 159 cu.m of mud remaining for the next section, at \$4,914.69 and \$4,668.37 received from the previous section, the net cost for the interval was \$10,964.24 (41%). The extra cost was incurred by the volume and frequency of the high viscosity sweeps used.

#### 12<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>" HOLE SECTION

The interval cost \$40,022.76, plus the mud value recovered from the previous interval \$4,914.69 gives a net mud cost of \$44,937.45. This is \$5,328.89 or 11% below programmed cost. The saving is largely due to the amount of BARITE and IDBOND used.

#### 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" HOLE SECTION

The interval cost at \$57,770.45 was less than the programmed cost of \$62,626.51 by \$4,856.06 (8%). The saving resulted from reduced BARITE consumption, which in turn was offset by increased polymer usage to minimise tight hole on trips.

#### TOTAL WELL

The total well cost at \$121,193.25 was \$5,292.25 (4.2%) less than the estimated cost of \$126,485.50 due to an over-estimation in the 12<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" hole section. However, the result represents very good correlation of anticipated and actual costs.