

2024 SOFTWARE SYMPOSIUM

www.spee.org

History and Guidelines

2024 was 7th Symposium



- Society has targeted a Software Symposium every 2 years
- Previous events held in 2000, 2004, 2009, 2011, 2015, 2018 and 2020 (cancelled) focused on comparing Economic Cashflow Calculations

2024 Symposium focused on Automated Forecasting

- Datasets are getting bigger and computers are getting faster
- Industry has a need for speed, efficiency and accuracy
- Software companies are creative and competitive



Thank You



Chairman: Lucas Smith, Oxy Vendor Liaison: Zack Warren, Velocity Insight Marketing: Christina Hilton, Accelerate Resources Administration: Andrea Bracho, SPEE

Technical

David Fulford, EIV Capital John Wright, Wright Consulting Steven Golko, Sproule Helene Berthet, Total Energies

Volunteers

Kyle Chandler, IOG Resources Herbert Lescanne, Total Energies Yonss Jose, Total Energies Lindsey Stelmach, Oxy Ashish Ghotekar, ExxonMobil

Omnira MOSAIC PDQ Decide Quorum Val Nav S&P Harmony **Upstream Edge Predico Advanced Flow Analytics**

Proved (\$2500)

RC Consultants L.C.

OGRE

Corporate

The Bake-Off Forecast 1000 Wells in 12 Hours

- All onshore U.S. horizontal wells drilled in the last 20 years
- 922 real wells with truncated data across eight basins
 - DJ Basin case study on human hand-forecasting versus machine
- 100 synthetic wells for full forecast life error determination
- Locations slightly anonymized with lat-longs slightly shifted
 - Well header data provided
- Time limit of 12 hours

Preparing the Data

Maximum History of 4 Years

- "Test" data has between 7 and 48 months of history provided
- "Answer key" has 20 to 213 months available for analysis and longer for synthetic wells
- Peaks:
 - 140,000 bopd oil
 - 3.1 BCFD gas
 - 210,000 bwpd water

Goal of Guiding Developers

Methods

- Get prescriptive on error definitions and calculations
- No emphasis on speed or accuracy for our analysis participant's choice
- Qualitative survey to record how participants worked
- Committee formed hypotheses before getting any data back

Goals

- Providing guidance to practitioners and vendors on what's working and where improvements are needed
- Committee will not declare winners/losers

Primary Results

4 Major Challenges

• Automated forecasting is steadily getting better, but engineering judgement is still necessary

Error Conclusions

- Median error for all vendor forecasts across all wells is nearly zero...
 - But this not true in all subsets, e.g. by [Vendor] or by [Basin]
- Variance of error varies across all subsets
 - Vendors did not perform equally on all wells despite, on average, having nearly zero error
- Some vendors had symmetrical variance of log errors
 - Vendors were just as likely to be 10% too high as 10% too low
- When vendors had large errors, they tended to under-forecast as opposed to over-forecast

Basin Rankings

- Vendors performed:
 - Best on gas wells
 - Worst on gas condensate wells
 - Oil wells in between

Overall Scoring (2/3 Absolute Value of Median Log Error + 1/3 StdDev of Log Error):

- 1. Appalachian Marcellus
- 2. Fort Worth Barnett
- 3. Synthetic Midland Wolfcamp A
- 4. Delaware Wolfcamp A
- 5. Western Gulf Eagle Ford

6. DJ

- 7. Midland Lower Spraberry
- 8. Ark-La-Tex Haynesville
- 9. Delaware Avalon
- 10. Williston

All Wells

Major Phase

First 3 months GOR

3mo GOR Bin

Months of History

Calendar Months History Bins

Basin/Reservoir

Basin - Reservoir

Avg Log Error

Secondary Phases

Algorithms Showed Difficulty

- Primary phases (oil for oil wells, gas for gas wells) are typically the economic and volumetric focus, but secondary phases are also important
 - –Gas in oil wells
 - –Oil in gas wells
 - –Water
- Lots of implied ratio forecasts violate our expectations about the shapes of curves
 - –Algorithms consistently **under-forecast** GOR's on oil wells
 - –Algorithms consistently **over-forecast** CGR's on gas wells
 - –A more Bayesian approach could be helpful

Oil Volume V • Filtered to tin • Values are re • Filtered to bl	ariance me periode maining v lack/volatil	s with trun olumes fro e oil wells	ocated da om start o with 1st t	ta of forecast (hree month	(7/1/2024) n GOR <3		 Observations: Participants generally too optimistic about DJ, Eagle Ford, and Midland Too pessimistic about Delaware, Synthetic, and Williston Bravo, Echo, November, and Oscar >15% optimistic Hotel, Charlie, Alpha, and Kilo >15% pessimistic 							
Basin Vendor Name	DELAWAF Oil Vol, MMBO	E Oil Variance, %	DJ Oil Vol, MMBO	Oil Variance, %	EAGLE FO Oil Vol, MMBO	ORD Oil Variance, %	MIDLAN Oil Vol, MMBO	ID Oil Variance, %	SYNTHE Oil Vol, MMBO	TIC Oil Variance, %	WILLIST Oil Vol, MMBO	ON Oil Variance, %	Total Oil Vol, MMBO	Oil Variance, % ▼
Bravo	21.5	49.9%	13.5	59.7%	4.1	102.3%	19.6	65.2%	47.1	37.2%	17.3	50.0%	123.2	48.8%
Echo	19.4	36.5%	9.5	25.3%	3.9	99.8%	15.6	31.8%	41.8	42.7%	15.8	41.5%	106.0	39.6%
November	16.7	18.2%	9.8	19.3%	2.8	39.8%	15.1	27.0%	39.6	22.6%	12.5	9.8%	96.5	20.8%
Oscar	14.6	2.1%	9.5	16.3%	2.5	24.2%	14.0	17.6%	44.6	30.5%	12.4	7.4%	97.7	19.2%
Foxtrot	14.0	-2.1%	10.6	25.0%	2.3	12.1%	13.9	16.5%	34.8	3.6%	11.0	-4.8%	86.5	5.6%
Delta	13.7	-3.7%	9.8	15.7%	2.5	22.2%	13.5	13.3%	31.9	-2.2%	10.7	-7.5%	82.0	1.4%
actuals - key	14.3	0.0%	8.5	0.0%	2.0	0.0%	11.9	0.0%	36.6	0.0%	11.5	0.0%	84.9	0.0%
India	13.3	-7.5%	8.0	-1.1%	2.2	8.1%	12.2	3.1%	30.7	-1.9%	9.8	-11.4%	76.2	-3.1%
Gulf	13.7	-4.4%	9.0	6.4%	2.3	11.4%	12.9	8.3%	29.3	-8.7%	10.4	-9.5%	77.6	-3.7%
Mike	12.7	-11.6%	9.1	7.7%	2.4	18.0%	11.8	-0.4%	30.5	-8.1%	9.6	-17.1%	76.0	-6.6%
Juliet	13.2	-7.8%	8.8	4.8%	1.6	-19.2%	12.5	4.8%	27.7	-14.7%	10.4	-9.5%	74.3	-8.3%
Lima	12.1	-15.9%	8.3	-1.7%	2.2	8.4%	12.9	8.7%	25.0	-23.2%	9.6	-16.8%	70.1	-13.7%
Hotel	12.5	-12.6%	7.0	-17.0%	2.3	14.8%	11.8	-0.4%	25.7	-21.2%	9.1	-21.3%	68.6	-15.6%
Charlie	13.5	-5.7%	7.7	-5.0%	1.9	-9.0%	11.8	-1.1%	20.1	-29.6%	9.6	-17.0%	64.5	-16.9%
Alpha	11.0	-23.5%	5.0	-41.0%	1.9	-8.7%	12.0	1.1%	25.3	-22.5%	8.1	-29.7%	63.2	-21.8%
Kilo	10.8	-24.7%	8.0	-5.9%	2.3	10.4%	9.5	-19.7%	23.0	-28.8%	8.0	-31.0%	61.5	-23.9%

Gas Well Volume Cross-plot	Basin				
Filtered to time periods with truncated data	All				
Values are remaining volumes from start of forecast (7/1/2024)					
 Filtered to gas condensate / wet gas / dry gas wells with 1st three month GOR > 3,200 cf/bo 					
 Filtered out gas basins due to lack of oil 					

Entrance Rates drive the bus – why Bravo is optimistic

Gas Wells Example: Kilo Eagle Ford with rising CGR's and WGR's

25

Oil Wells Example: Oscar DJ Well

OWG Variance

oil variance, % and oil variance, % by Vendor Name and WellName

gas variance, % by Vendor Name and WellName

DJ Basin Example Oil Primary Phase much closer forecast than secondary phases by most vendors

SOCIETY OF PETROLEUM EVALUATION ENGINEERS

Short vs Long History

Conclusions are Mixed

- On one hand, results became more reliable with a longer production history
 - —Mean variability trending towards 0% when auto-forecasting with three to four years of production history
 - –Distribution of results becomes much "cleaner" with more production history, and most results are +/- 10% of the key
- On the other hand, there is still a lot of variability in the results —Wide variance from play to play and from vendor to vendor
 - –Outlier events **widen** with a longer production history

Oil - Variance Tightens

- Plots show variance of oil with different production histories
- Distribution becomes tighter and more normal when more production history is used for forecasting

nt oil variance and cum freg oil variance by Value and Vendor Name

nt_oil variance and cum freq_oil variance by Value and Vendor Name

Oil Well Volume Box and Whisker

- Filtered to time periods with truncated data
- Values are remaining volumes from start of forecast (7/1/2024)
- Filtered to Black Oil and Volatile Oil wells with 1st three month GO <3.200 cf/bo
- · Filtered out Synthetic due to all vendors being pessimistic, gas basins due to lack of oil

120.0% Overall range of 100.0%

variance stays the same with

more production history, but the results are more concentrated

Basin Multiple selections

Gas - Variance Tightens

- Plots show variance of gas with different production histories
- Distribution becomes tighter and more normal when more production history is used for forecasting

Bravo

Delta

Echo

Gulf

Hotel

India

Juliet

Kilo

Lima

Mike

cnt_gas variance and cum freq_gas variance by Value and Vendor Name

Gas Well Volume Box and Whisker Plot Basin • Filtered to time periods with truncated data Multiple selections • Values are remaining volumes from start of forecast (7/1/2024) Multiple selections • Filtered to gas condensate / wet gas / dry gas wells with 1st three month GO > 3.200 cf/bo Multiple selections

• Filtered out Synthetic due to all vendors being pessimistic, gas basins due to lack of oil

Overall range of variance **gets larger** with more production history, but the results are more concentrated

EUR Variability

Variability Examples

EUR Variability

Certain basins have more uniform distribution of forecast volumes

Consistent Error by Vendor

Avg Perc Err per Basin and Vendor

(Column Names)	Basin	Alpha	Bravo	Charlie	Delta	Echo	Foxtrot	Gulf	Hotel	India	Juliet	Kilo	Lima	Mike	November	Oscar	Grand total	Data table:
Avg Perc Err	DELAWARE	-18%	63%	-9%	-6%	72%	4%	-5%	-10%	-2%	-3%	-26%	-7%	2%	38%	18%	7%	ForecastOneline Wi.
	DJ	-47%	77%	-19%	13%	45%	26%	1%	-22%	-9%	12%	-19%	4%	15%	28%	32%	9%	Colors:
	EAGLE FORD	-22%	100%	-24%	20%	114%	5%	12%	-7%	1%	-29%	-10%	-27%	29%	29%	43%	16%	Max
	MIDLAND	-10%	76%	<mark>-14</mark> %	8%	37%	15%	-3%	-21%	6%	-2%	-38%	5%	-2%	39%	34%	9%	0
	SYNTHETIC	-18%	87%	-22%	19%	36%	23%	3%	-17%	0%	0%	-25%	-26%	15%	37%	62%	12%	-1
	WILLISTON	-18%	82%	-16%	1%	96%	12%	1%	-19%	0%	5%	-24%	-12%	-11%	30%	37%	11%	
Grand total		-23%	79%	-17%	8%	66%	14%	1%	-16%	-1%	-2%	-24%	-10%	8%	34%	36%	10%	

Error Reduced with Review

Percent Error from Median By Automation Amount

Percent Error from	Median By Forecast	Review Amount
--------------------	--------------------	---------------

			Autofcst Amount		
	Basin	All auto	Mostly auto	Half auto	Mostly manual
	DELAWARE	17%	1%	-4%	-3%
	DJ	13%	9%	-4%	12%
	EAGLE FORD	28%	9%	11%	-29%
Ц	MIDLAND	15%	10%	-12%	-2%
Basi	SYNTHETIC	14%	17%	-1%	0%
	WILLISTON	22%	7%	-15%	5%

		Review Am	ount		
Basin	None	Some	Half	Most	All
DELAWARE	34%	14%	-4%	-9%	-6%
DJ	23%	20%	-4%	-19%	-1%
EAGLE FORD	63%	31%	11%	-24%	-18%
	17%	21%	-12%	-14%	2%
SYNTHETIC	20%	30%	-1%	-22%	-5%
WILLISTON	48%	21%	-15%	-16%	-3%

Human vs Machine

DJ Basin Example

Human

- DJ Basin wells were hand forecasted and compared to machine forecasted
- Best machines were comparable to the best humans
- Worst machines were much worse than the worst humans

ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS

Automated forecasting is getting better steadily. Engineering judgement is still required, but software comfort factor is increasing.

Some basins and reservoirs are more homogeneous in forecast shape. Less variability leads to better agreement in software forecasting.

Longer periods of historical production reduce the error in forecasting. However recent operational upsets drive large forecast variations by vendor.

Primary phase forecasts with larger errors tends to underpredict actual production. Secondary forecasts tend to be too low on oil wells and too high on gas wells.

INDUSTRY CONCLUSIONS

- Sweet spot between speed and accuracy. Current need is heavier focus on accuracy.
- General areas for improvement:
 - Short histories
 - Operational upsets
 - B factor consistency
 - Secondary products
- The software vendors participating in the 2024 Software Symposium have helped create a tremendous dataset worth additional time and resources to study.
- The evaluation continues and look for presentations at future SPEE Chapter road show luncheons and the 2025 SPEE Annual Meeting in Hilton Head, SC.

- The software vendors participating in the 2024 Software Symposium have helped create a tremendous dataset that warrants additional time and resources to study
- Plan to present a workshop at the 2025 SPEE Conference in Hilton Head, SC June 7-10
- More to come!

Questions

If you want to help in 2026, email symposium@spee.org

Backup Slides

Problem Statement

Set up like the first pass of a data room evaluation

- Forecast 1000 wells
- Production and well header data provided
- Time limit of 12 hours
- Well specifics are unknown ahead of time

Certain parameters defined for consistent analysis

- Sample files of header and production format provided
- Sample file of output format provided
- Common cutoff of 60 bopm or 30 years
- If used, select common minimum decline of 6%

Well

Basin - Reservoir » API14

Bias vs. Variance

Gas Volume V • Filtered to tin • Values are re • Filtered to bl	Variance me period emaining v lack/volati	for Oil We Is with trunca olumes fron le wells with	lls ated data n start of f 1st three r	orecast (7/ month GOI	'1/2024) R <3.200 c	Obse • Pari • Bra • <u>Twe</u>	Observations: • Participants generally too pessimistic about all basins • Bravo > 15% optimistic • <u>Twelve</u> vendors >15% too pessimistic							
Basin	DELAWA	RE	DJ	-	EAGLE FO	RD	MIDLAN	D	SYNTHETIC		WILLISTON		Total	
Vendor Name	Gas Vol,	Gas	Gas Vol,	Gas	Gas Vol,	Gas	Gas Vol,	Gas	Gas Vol,	Gas	Gas Vol,	Gas	Gas Vol,	Gas
	RCF	% %	RCF	variance, %	BCF	variance, %	RCF	% %	BCF	% %	BCF	% %	BCF	variance, % ▼
Bravo	144.2	25.3%	106.2	10.8%	16.2	99.3%	42.6	16.4%	155.2	2.5%	63.1	56.8%	527.6	17.1%
actuals - key	115.0	0.0%	95.9	0.0%	8.1	0.0%	36.6	0.0%	175.3	0.0%	40.3	0.0%	471.2	0.0%
Echo	114.1	0.3%	40.4	-38.9%	10.9	40.8%	36.4	1.4%	123.9	7.4%	39.6	3.7%	365.3	-4.0%
Oscar	107.8	-6.3%	100.7	7.8%	8.7	7.1%	31.6	-13.5%	134.0	-9.1%	36.7	-8.8%	419.5	-5.0%
Foxtrot	104.6	-7.4%	85.1	-11.2%	8.0	-2.0%	34.6	-5.3%	111.8	-22.1%	29.8	-26.1%	373.9	-15.0%
November	105.5	-7.8%	70.9	-20.5%	10.2	26.5%	26.8	-26.8%	103.4	-18.8%	30.4	-22.5%	347.3	-16.6%
Mike	103.2	-9.3%	77.7	-18.9%	8.7	7.5%	36.1	-1.2%	105.1	-25.7%	25.7	-36.2%	356.6	-18.7%
Juliet	109.9	-4.4%	83.6	-12.6%	6.0	-25.6%	32.1	-12.4%	90.3	-32.7%	31.9	-20.9%	353.7	-19.0%
Gulf	103.7	-9.9%	80.6	-15.9%	8.4	2.9%	28.5	-22.0%	85.2	-33.6%	28.1	-30.1%	334.5	-22.4%
Lima	102.0	-11.3%	70.6	-26.4%	8.4	3.5%	28.6	-22.0%	102.4	-27.7%	26.2	-35.0%	338.1	-23.1%
India	94.5	-17.8%	67.6	-24.2%	8.0	-1.0%	27.4	-24.8%	82.3	-32.0%	24.1	-36.1%	303.9	-26.2%
Charlie	99.0	-13.9%	63.1	-28.9%	6.6	-18.3%	31.6	-13.7%	69.1	-36.4%	26.1	-35.2%	295.5	-27.2%
Alpha	101.0	-12.2%	70.7	-26.2%	7.0	-13.8%	27.2	-25.6%	82.1	-39.3%	25.6	-36.4%	313.7	-28.3%
Hotel	97.6	-15.2%	54.6	-43.1%	7.8	-3.4%	26.6	-27.3%	83.6	-38.4%	23.2	-42.5%	293.4	-32.6%
Delta	81.1	-27.5%	59.5	-38.0%	8.2	0.4%	26.0	-29.0%	79.6	-37.1%	24.2	-40.0%	278.5	-33.9%
Kilo	78.8	-31.5%	68.5	-28.6%	6.7	-17.6%	23.3	-36.3%	50.0	-57.6%	15.2	-62.3%	242.5	-43.4%

Gas Volume V • Filtered to tin • Values are re • Filtered to ga > 3.200 cf/bo • Excluded No	Varian me per emainin as conc vembe	<u>ce</u> iods with t ng volumes densate / v er (didn't fo	runcated s from sta vet gas / o precast ga	data rt of forecast dry gas wells s basins)	: (7/1/2024 with 1st t	4) hree mont	h GOR	 Observations: Participants generally too optimistic about Haynesville Too pessimistic about Appalachia, Delaware, DJ (only 9 wells), Eagle Ford, and Fort Worth Bravo and Oscar >15% optimistic Kilo >15% pessimistic 							
Basin	APPAL	ACHIAN	DELAWA	RF	DJ		EAGLE FO	RD	FORT W	/ORTH	HAYNE	SVILLE	Total		
Vendor Name	Gas	Gas	Gas Vol.	Gas	Gas Vol.	Gas	Gas Vol.	Vol Gas		Gas Gas		Gas	Gas Vol. Gas		
	Vol,	Variance,	BCF	Variance,	BCF	Variance,	BCF	Variance,	Vol,	Variance,	Vol,	Variance,	BCF	Variance,	
	BCF	%		%		%		%	BCF	%	BCF	%		%	
Bravo	331.2	50.0%	89.6	46.9%	4.2	-15.0%	41.6	62.1%	146.5	65.4%	388.2	66.3%	1001.3	57.8%	
Oscar	219.5	-0.6%	52.5	-14.1%	3.5	-26.8%	27.8	8.4%	79.7	-10.0%	364.0	55.9%	747.0	17.7%	
Echo	240.8	9.0%	59.5	-0.5%	2.6	-47.8%	25.9	6.0%	119.5	35.0%	243.4	4.2%	691.6	9.4%	
Delta	212.0	-4.0%	41.1	-32.6%	2.8	-42.8%	24.6	-4.1%	76.1	-14.1%	322.6	38.2%	679.2	7.0%	
Gulf	197.6	-10.5%	50.1	-18.0%	3.0	-39.4%	23.9	-6.8%	74.5	-15.9%	313.4	34.2%	662.4	4.4%	
Foxtrot	226.5	2.6%	52.4	-14.2%	3.5	-29.3%	22.2	-13.0%	81.7	-7.7%	262.7	12.5%	649.1	2.3%	
actuals - key	220.8	0.0%	61.0	0.0%	4.9	0.0%	25.7	0.0%	88.6	0.0%	233.5	0.0%	634.5	0.0%	
India	195.4	-11.5%	44.9	-26.3%	3.2	-34.1%	19.5	-19.4%	76.2	-14.0%	288.6	23.6%	627.8	-0.9%	
Mike	203.7	-7.8%	49.3	-19.2%	3.6	-27.5%	25.7	0.2%	75.6	-14.6%	256.6	9.9%	614.5	-3.1%	
Lima	198.4	-10.2%	49.0	-19.7%	3.2	-34.6%	19.1	-25.4%	73.1	-17.5%	259.7	11.2%	602.5	-5.0%	
Hotel	202.8	-8.2%	50.3	-17.6%	3.4	-31.4%	20.2	-21.5%	71.7	-19.1%	252.3	8.1%	600.6	-5.3%	
Juliet	189.5	-14.2%	55.9	-8.4%	3.9	-21.3%	16.5	-33.9%	79.6	-10.1%	239.7	2.6%	585.1	-7.7%	
Charlie	202.7	-8.2%	52.3	-14.3%	2.8	-40.4%	19.9	-22.0%	72.3	-18.4%	230.4	-1.3%	580.4	-8.5%	

16.5

17.4

-35.9%

-32.3%

71.4

59.9

-19.4%

-32.4%

247.4

243.7

5.9%

4.4%

577.5

533.2

-9.0%

-16.0%

Alpha

Kilo

196.1

174.1

-11.2%

-21.2%

42.8

35.8

-29.8%

-41.4%

3.3

2.4

-32.5%

-51.6%

Oil Volume V • Filtered to tin • Values are re • Filtered to ga > 3.200 cf/bc • Filtered out A	'ariance f me period emaining v as conden o Appalachia	or Gas W s with trun volumes fro sate / wet a, Fort Wo	′<u>ells</u> acated da om start o gas / dry rth, and I	ita of forecast (7 gas wells v Haynesville	(7/1/2024) with 1st th due to la) iree month ck of oil vo	GOR Iumes	Observations: • Echo and Bravo >15% optimistic • Lima, Kilo, and Alpha >15% pessimistic					
Basin		RF	DI		FAGLE FO		Total						
Vendor Name	Oil Vol	Oil		Oil		Oil	Oil Vol	Oil					
vendor i vanie	MMBO	Variance	MMBO	Variance	MMBO	Variance	MMBO	Variance					
	initia bo	%	initia bo	%	MINDO	%		%					
								¥					
Bravo	8.4	56.7%	0.8	77.6%	6.1	73.2%	15	63.9	%				
Echo	8.2	55.5%	0.8	78.8%	5.1	51.5%	14	.1 55.1	%				
November	6.1	13.4%	0.5	15.9%	3.7	7.8%	10).2 11.4	26				
Oscar	5.1	-4.6%	<mark>0.4</mark>	7.8%	4.2	19.6%	9	9.7 5.1	%				
Delta	5.2	-2.3%	0.4	-5.4%	4.0	13.9%	9	.6 3.7	%				
actuals - key	5.4	0.0%	0.4	0.0%	3.5	0.0%	9	0.0	%				
Mike	4.9	-8.4%	0.4	2.3%	3.9	12.4%	9	.3 -0.1	%				
Foxtrot	5.4	1.8%	0.4	1.7%	3.3	-4.3%	9	-0.5	%				
Gulf	5.3	-1.5%	0.4	-6.2%	3.5	0.6%	9	.2 -0.9	%				
Charlie	5.7	5.6%	0.4	-9.2%	2.8	-18.1%	8	-4.0	%				
India	4.9	-8.3%	0.4	-7.0%	3.2	-5.9%	8	3.4 -7.3	%				
Hotel	5.0	-5.8%	0.4	3.8%	3.0	-12.9%	8	8.5 -8.1	%				
Juliet	5.4	1.1%	0.4	2.4%	2.5	-26.3%	8	3.4 -9.2 [°]	%				
Lima	4.7	-12.4%	0.5	11.1%	2.6	-26.9%	7	.7 -16.8	%				
Kilo	4.2	-22.1%	0.3	-28.9%	2.9	-15.8%	7	.4 -20.0	%				
Alpha	4.2	-22.3%	0.4	1.4%	2.4	-32.9%	e	-25.2	%				

3 Best Humans and 4 Best Machines

3 Worst Humans and 4 Worst Machines

