© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

Integrity Assurance of FSO Turret Mooring Systems: A Review of Inspection, Monitoring and Life-Extension Strategies

PAUL CHIBUIKE OBETTA[1], NWAKAMMA NINDUWEZUOR-EHIOBU[2]
[1]*STIS Nigeria Ltd for TotalEnergies, Nigeria*
[2]*FieldCore Canada, A GE Vernova company*

Abstract- Floating Storage and Offloading (FSO) units moored through turret systems represent critical infrastructure in offshore hydrocarbon production, and their station-keeping systems are permanently exposed to cyclic environmental loading, corrosion and mechanical wear over service lives that frequently exceed twenty years. Industry experience over the past two decades has shown that mooring line failures occur at rates far higher than the nominal annual probabilities assumed in design, with several multiple-line failure events resulting in vessel drift-off, riser rupture and production shutdown. This paper reviews the state of practice and the state of the art in integrity assurance for FSO turret mooring systems as of 2019. The principal degradation mechanisms affecting chain, wire rope, connectors and turret bearing assemblies are summarised, including uniform and microbially influenced corrosion, fatigue in the splash zone and thrash zone, out-of-plane bending of chain links, and wear at interlink contact surfaces. Conventional inspection techniques based on general visual inspection and close visual inspection by divers and remotely operated vehicles are critically assessed against their known limitations in defect detectability. Emerging monitoring technologies are then reviewed, covering direct tension monitoring, inclination-based load inference, sonar and vision-based line tracking, and vessel position monitoring using differential global navigation satellite systems, together with data-driven anomaly detection methods. Frameworks for mooring integrity management contained in API RP 2MIM, ISO 19901-7 and DNVGL offshore standards are compared, and life-extension methodologies encompassing residual fatigue assessment, corrosion allowance re-evaluation, component replacement and requalification are discussed. The review concludes that a risk-based integrity management strategy that integrates periodic inspection with continuous monitoring and probabilistic remaining-life assessment offers the most credible pathway for safe life extension of ageing FSO turret mooring systems, and identifies research gaps in corrosion prognosis, chain fatigue under combined degradation, and the validation of indirect monitoring methods.

Keywords: FSO; turret mooring; mooring integrity management; inspection; structural health monitoring; life extension; fatigue; corrosion.

I. INTRODUCTION

Floating Storage and Offloading units, together with their production-capable counterparts (FPSOs), constitute the dominant development solution for offshore fields where fixed infrastructure or export pipelines are uneconomic. The turret mooring system is central to this concept: it anchors the vessel to the seabed through a cluster of mooring legs attached to a turret structure around which the hull weathervanes, allowing the vessel to align itself with the prevailing environment while maintaining continuous fluid transfer through a swivel stack. The turret may be mounted internally within the hull or cantilevered externally at the bow, and may be permanently connected or disconnectable in regions exposed to cyclones or ice.

The consequences of mooring system failure for a turret-moored FSO are severe. Loss of a single line redistributes load to adjacent lines and erodes the design safety margin; loss of multiple lines can lead to vessel drift-off, rupture of risers and umbilicals, hydrocarbon release, and collision risk with adjacent installations or shuttle tankers. Industry surveys have documented a persistent gap between the reliability assumed at the design stage, where target annual line failure probabilities are typically of the order of one in ten thousand, and the reliability actually observed in service, where recorded failure rates per line-year have been estimated to be two orders of magnitude higher. Fontaine et al. (2014) compiled over one hundred mooring incidents involving permanent floating production systems between 1997 and 2012, while Ma et al. (2013) and Kvitrud (2014) documented recurrent failure causes on the UK and Norwegian continental shelves including fatigue, corrosion, mechanical damage and manufacturing defects.

At the same time, a large fraction of the global FSO and FPSO fleet is approaching or has exceeded its original design life, and operators increasingly seek to extend field life beyond the certified duration of the mooring system. Life extension of a permanently moored unit is complicated by the fact that the mooring system cannot readily be dry-docked or fully replaced, that much of it is buried, embedded or otherwise difficult to access, and that the historical loading and degradation state of individual components is often poorly known. These circumstances have motivated a substantial body of joint industry projects, regulatory guidance and academic research on mooring integrity management, culminating in the publication of API RP 2MIM in 2019 as the first dedicated recommended practice for mooring integrity management.

The historical arc is worth sketching because it explains the shape of current practice. Through the 1990s, mooring assurance for permanent units was inherited largely from mobile drilling practice: periodic certification survey, hardware inspection guidance in API RP 2I, and confidence in design factors. The failure experience of the late 1990s and 2000s, culminating in high-profile events and the first systematic industry surveys, established that permanent service in a fixed heading envelope, with decades of uninterrupted immersion, produced degradation regimes that mobile-unit practice had never confronted. The joint industry projects of the 2000s and 2010s supplied the missing science, corrosion in warm waters, out-of-plane bending, integrity management structure, and the 2010s saw the corresponding institutional response: regulator guidance, class scheme development, monitoring technology maturation and finally the consolidation of management practice into a dedicated recommended document. An FSO entering service in 2019 therefore inherits both a far better understanding of its threats than its 1990s predecessors enjoyed and an explicit expectation that the operator will demonstrate integrity continuously rather than assume it from design.

This paper reviews inspection, monitoring and life-extension strategies for FSO turret mooring systems in light of that development. Section 2 describes the configuration of turret mooring systems and identifies the components that dominate integrity risk. Section 3 reviews degradation mechanisms and observed failure modes. Sections 4 and 5 assess inspection practice and monitoring technology respectively. Section 6 compares the principal integrity management frameworks and standards, and Section 7 reviews life-extension methodology. Section 8 discusses cross-cutting findings and research gaps, Section 9 outlines future directions, and Section 10 presents conclusions.

The review is confined to permanently moored, turret-based FSO and FPSO units and to the station-keeping function; hull structural integrity, riser integrity and the process plant are outside its scope except where they interact with the mooring system. The literature base comprises the recognised design and in-service standards of the American Petroleum Institute, the International Organization for Standardization and the major classification societies, the published findings of the joint industry projects that have dominated mooring integrity research since the early 2000s, notably the Floating Production System Mooring Integrity series, the SCORCH corrosion project and the chain out-of-plane bending project, papers from the Offshore Technology Conference and the International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering, regulator publications from the United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive and the Petroleum Safety Authority Norway, and selected journal literature on corrosion and fatigue of marine steels. Emphasis is placed on findings with direct operational consequence, that is, on what the accumulated evidence implies for how inspection, monitoring and assessment should actually be conducted.

II. FSO TURRET MOORING SYSTEMS: CONFIGURATION AND CRITICAL COMPONENTS

2.1 Turret arrangements

An internal turret is integrated into the forward hull structure and transfers mooring loads into the vessel through a bearing system, most commonly a large-diameter three-race roller bearing or a bogie-and-rail arrangement for very high load capacities. An external turret is supported on a bow extension and offers simpler integration for conversions, which are common for FSOs derived from trading tankers. Disconnectable turrets employ a buoyant spider or riser turret mooring buoy that can be released and left on station while the vessel sails to shelter. In all cases the turret assembly comprises the chain table or spider to which mooring legs terminate, the bearing and its support structure, the swivel or fluid transfer system, and associated locking, sealing and lubrication systems.

Bearing arrangements deserve elaboration because they define the turret's critical non-redundant element. Three-race roller bearings carry axial, radial and overturning loads in a single large-diameter assembly, offering compact integration at the cost of concentrated criticality: raceway damage propagates under load and full replacement offshore approaches the limit of feasibility. Bogie-and-rail systems distribute the vertical load across many wheeled bogie units running on circumferential rails, accepting greater complexity in exchange for element-level replaceability, and were adopted for the highest-load internal turrets precisely for that maintainability. Sliding pad arrangements, polymer pads on machined ways, appear on some external and disconnectable systems, trading rolling efficiency for tolerance of misalignment and simple pad renewal. Each architecture implies its own surveillance signature, race settlement and debris for roller systems, individual bogie load and wheel condition for rail systems, pad wear and friction torque for sliding systems, and the integrity plan should be written against the architecture actually installed rather than generically.

2.2 Mooring legs and components

Mooring legs for permanently moored FSOs are usually catenary or semi-taut arrangements composed of studless or studlink chain segments at the top and bottom, with steel spiral-strand wire rope or, increasingly, polyester fibre rope in the middle sections. Terminations and connecting hardware include H-links, D-shackles, Kenter-type joining links, tri-plates, subsea connectors and fairleads or chain stoppers at the turret interface. Anchoring is provided by drag-embedment anchors, driven or suction piles, depending on soil conditions and load direction requirements, with design and installation practice for each anchor class set out in dedicated recommended practices (DNV, 2012; DNV, 2005) and in industry design manuals (Vryhof, 2010). Service experience shows that integrity risk concentrates at specific locations: the top chain in the splash zone and at the chain stopper, the touch-down or thrash zone where chain interacts cyclically with the seabed, connectors and terminations, and the turret bearing and its load path into the hull. Kenter links in particular have exhibited fatigue lives significantly shorter than common chain links and have been prohibited for permanent moorings by some regulators and class societies.

Anchor selection interacts with integrity in ways that persist for the life of the field. Drag embedment anchors develop capacity by plowing to depth in cohesive soils and resist reliably only in the horizontal plane, which obliges long catenary run and makes any vertical load at the anchor a design exclusion to be protected in service, including during line re-tensioning and replacement operations. Suction piles accept vertical load components, permit taut and semi-taut geometries, and place their padeye below mudline where the connecting chain segment experiences a distinctive buried corrosion environment; driven piles offer similar characteristics where installation spread economics favour them. Installation records, final penetration, proof load achieved, padeye orientation and as-laid line heading, become the permanent reference against which any later suspicion of anchor movement is judged, and their absence, encountered on older converted units, converts a simple verification question into an expensive geotechnical assessment.

2.3 Design basis and safety criteria

The integrity of a mooring system in service can only be judged against the basis on which it was designed. Contemporary design practice, codified in API RP 2SK, ISO 19901-7, DNVGL-OS-E301, the ABS position mooring guide and Bureau Veritas NR 493, requires the system to satisfy three limit states: an ultimate limit state under the design environment with all lines intact, an accident or damaged limit state with one line removed, and a fatigue limit state over the service life. Tension safety factors distinguish quasi-static from dynamic analysis and intact from one-line-damaged conditions, with typical dynamic-analysis factors of 1.67 intact and 1.25 damaged in API RP 2SK, while DNVGL-OS-E301 applies a partial safety factor format calibrated by structural reliability analysis to consequence-class targets. Fatigue design applies safety factors of three or more on calculated life, rising where inspection is impractical. Reliability-based calibration studies (Hørte et al., 2017) have re-examined these factors against target annual failure probabilities, an exercise given practical urgency by the persistent excess of observed over target failure rates discussed in Section 3.5.

Design analysis practice also frames what in-service data can and cannot confirm. Coupled or de-coupled time-domain simulation of the vessel, turret and lines under combined wave, wind and current loading generates the tension distributions from which safety factors and fatigue damage are computed, building on the single point mooring dynamics established in early simulation research (Wichers, 1988). The governing responses of a turret-moored ship, low-frequency surge and sway resonance, wave-frequency tension cycling and the slowly varying heading of the weathervaning hull, determine both the fatigue spectrum experienced by each component and the signatures available to monitoring systems. Because line tensions are dominated by vessel offset and catenary geometry, measured position and top-chain angle carry substantial information about the load state of the whole system, a fact exploited by the indirect monitoring methods reviewed in Section 5.

2.4 The FSO operational context

Several features distinguish the FSO population from the broader floating production fleet and shape its integrity risk profile. Many FSOs are conversions of trading tankers, moored in shallow to moderate water depths off West Africa, Southeast Asia and the Middle East, and a substantial number serve as storage and export terminals receiving production from adjacent platforms rather than hosting processing themselves. Shallow water steepens the catenary response, concentrating dynamic tension and seabed interaction in short line lengths, while warm, biologically productive waters drive the accelerated corrosion documented by the SCORCH project. Export duty adds recurrent tandem or side-by-side offloading to shuttle tankers, with associated hawser loads, thruster wash and collision exposure at the stern or amidships, and berthing frequencies of several times per month. Turret hardware on converted units is often of earlier design generations, with chain stoppers and hawse geometries that predate the recognition of out-of-plane bending fatigue. Finally, commercial arrangements for FSOs frequently involve changes of ownership and operatorship over the field life, with the attendant risk of loss of design documentation and inspection history that Section 6 identifies as a recurrent integrity management weakness.

Export operations couple into mooring integrity through several paths. During tandem offloading the shuttle tanker imposes hawser load at the FSO stern, shifting the equilibrium heading and offset and loading the mooring asymmetrically for periods of a day or more at a time; repeated over hundreds of offloads, this contributes a distinct low-frequency component to the fatigue spectrum of specific lines that design assessments based on environment alone omit. Shuttle approach and departure create the fleet's most frequent collision exposure, and contact events, even minor, warrant line survey because installation experience shows chain damage from anchor-handling and vessel contact concentrating near the surface. Offloading also constrains the maintenance calendar: line de-tensioning campaigns and bearing interventions must schedule around export parcels, and the integrity plan gains robustness by identifying in advance which operations can proceed concurrently with export and which cannot.

2.5 Materials, fabrication and qualification

Mooring chain for permanent systems is supplied in offshore grades R3 through R5, with proof and break load requirements, Charpy toughness and dimensional tolerances specified in DNVGL-OS-E302 and mirrored in class rules (DNV GL, 2015, OS-E302). Grade selection trades section size and weight against susceptibility: the higher-strength grades reduce catenary weight and improve payload but exhibit greater sensitivity to hydrogen, whether introduced in manufacture or generated in service by cathodic overprotection, and their qualification therefore includes controls on melt practice, heat treatment and hydrogen-related testing. Flash butt welding of links, the process step from which a disproportionate share of manufacturing-origin failures has derived, is qualified per production line and monitored through mechanical testing of sacrificial links, and proof loading of every length both screens gross defects and establishes the compressive residual stress state at the crown on which service fatigue performance partly depends.

Accessories, shackles, connecting links, tri-plates and subsea connectors, are forged or cast to equivalent grade systems, and their integrity record is worse per component than that of common links, reflecting geometric stress concentration, fit-up sensitivity and, historically, less mature qualification. Wire rope manufacture is governed by DNVGL-OS-E304, covering wire metallurgy, stranding, blocking compound and jacket extrusion, with termination socketing qualified as a separate operation because socket pour quality determines the fatigue performance of the assembly (DNV GL, 2015, OS-E304). Polyester rope qualification under ISO 18692 and DNVGL-OS-E303 addresses yarn properties, construction, splice performance and stiffness characterisation (ISO, 2007; DNV GL, 2015, OS-E303). For the integrity engineer, the practical import of the qualification system is traceability: certificates, test records and manufacturing identities are the documents against which an in-service anomaly is judged, and their preservation belongs to integrity management from day one.

2.6 Analysis methods for design and reassessment

Because every integrity judgement ultimately compares a measured or assumed condition against an analysed demand, the analysis toolset deserves brief review. The hydrodynamic foundations are standard (Faltinsen, 1990; Chakrabarti, 2005), and efficient formulations for dynamic mooring line tension were established early in the development of the field (Larsen and Sandvik, 1990). Quasi-static analysis balances mean environmental forces against the catenary restoring curve and adds dynamic effects through factors; it survives in screening roles but is inadequate for fatigue and for the taut or shallow-water configurations common to FSOs. Dynamic analysis in the time domain resolves wave-frequency and low-frequency tension explicitly, with the vessel treated either de-coupled, its motions computed first and imposed on the lines, or fully coupled where line and riser damping materially influence vessel response, as it does in deep water and for large line ensembles. Frequency-domain methods linearise drag and serve fatigue screening economically, while the design storm cases retain time-domain treatment. For integrity work two further analysis classes matter: transient analysis of the line-failure event itself, which determines the tension overshoot experienced by surviving lines and hence whether one failure plausibly precipitates others, and the damaged-equilibrium analysis that defines the watch-circle signatures on which position-based failure detection depends.

The fidelity items that decide whether analysis matches reality are known and worth listing, since reassessment inherits them: seabed friction and trenching geometry at the touch-down zone, which control bottom-chain tension range; line drag and added mass coefficients, modified by marine growth; the stiffness characterisation of polyester segments, load-history dependent by nature; low-frequency damping, to which computed offsets are acutely sensitive and which measured data can calibrate; and the interlink stiffness at the stopper that governs computed OPB stress. A reassessment that updates metocean criteria but retains default values for these items may present precision without accuracy; conversely, monitoring data, even from a subset of

© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

lines, can calibrate several of them directly, which is among the quieter benefits of instrumenting early.

III. DEGRADATION MECHANISMS AND FAILURE MODES

3.1 Corrosion

Uniform corrosion of chain in seawater is addressed in design through diameter corrosion allowances, typically of the order of 0.2 to 0.4 millimetres per year depending on zone. However, field measurements reported through the SCORCH joint industry project demonstrated that corrosion rates in warm, biologically active waters, notably offshore West Africa and Southeast Asia where many FSOs operate, can substantially exceed these allowances, with severe pitting and localised loss driven by microbially influenced corrosion. Accelerated corrosion has also been observed in the splash zone, where alternate wetting and oxygen availability increase attack, and at low-oxygen buried sections where sulphate-reducing bacteria are active. Pitting is more damaging than the equivalent uniform loss because it introduces stress concentrations that accelerate fatigue crack initiation.

The phenomenology of marine corrosion of mooring steels is well described by multi-phase models in which an initial oxygen-controlled rate declines as corrosion product accumulates and is later overtaken by anaerobic, microbially influenced processes, a structure formalised for immersion corrosion of mild and low-alloy steels by Melchers (2003) and extended to probabilistic representation of general loss and pitting extremes for marine infrastructure (Melchers and Jeffrey, 2008). For mooring chain this progression is modulated by zone: in the splash and inter-tidal zone, cyclic wetting sustains oxygen supply and rates remain high; in the continuously immersed catenary, rates moderate but microbiological activity can dominate in warm nutrient-rich waters; in the buried and touch-down zone, low oxygen favours sulphate-reducing bacteria whose action produces the deep, isolated pitting most damaging to fatigue. Field evidence assembled through the SCORCH joint industry project from chains and wire ropes recovered after service in Australian, West African and Southeast Asian waters (Fontaine, Rosen et al., 2014; Potts et al., 2017) recorded local corrosion rates several times the design allowance, strong within-line and between-line variability, and characteristic morphologies including broad patch attack, deep isolated pits and preferential attack at weld and grip regions.

Two implications follow for integrity practice. First, corrosion allowances and anode designs derived from temperate-water experience cannot be assumed conservative elsewhere; site-specific corrosion surveillance, through periodic dimensional measurement of the same identified links, is the only reliable basis for projecting section loss. Second, the damage relevant to strength and fatigue is not captured by average diameter alone: pit depth, pit density and morphology govern stress concentration, so measurement campaigns should record local minima and surface condition, not merely mean dimensions. Cathodic protection retrofits, sacrificial anode sleds connected to the top chain, and coating systems for splash-zone components have all been deployed as mitigations, with mixed reported effectiveness given the difficulty of maintaining electrical continuity across interlink contacts and the abrasion of coatings in the grip region. Inhibitor chemistry offers a further mitigation avenue in enclosed or semi-enclosed parts of the system, and systematic review of environmentally benign inhibitors derived from agricultural extracts for the protection of mild steel in acidic and alkaline media (Atta et al., 2018) indicates the direction of development, although application to open-sea mooring components remains constrained by dilution and delivery.

Marine growth deserves explicit treatment as a degradation-adjacent factor. Hard and soft fouling increases line diameter, drag and mass, raising both mean and dynamic tensions; measured growth profiles on long-serving West African and Southeast Asian units show thickness distributions well beyond generic design assumptions in the upper water column. Growth also obscures inspection surfaces, biases photogrammetric measurement if not removed, and hosts the biological communities implicated in microbially influenced corrosion beneath the fouling layer. Integrity programmes therefore treat growth surveys as data, feeding measured profiles back into re-analysis, and schedule cleaning not only as inspection preparation but occasionally as load management on units found operating beyond their hydrodynamic design basis.

3.2 Fatigue

Mooring components accumulate fatigue damage under wave-frequency and low-frequency cyclic tension. Design fatigue assessment is normally performed using T-N curves for chain and wire rope, or S-N approaches with appropriate stress concentration factors for connectors, with intended safety factors of three or more on life. Service experience has nonetheless revealed fatigue mechanisms not adequately captured by conventional tension-tension assessment. The most prominent is out-of-plane bending (OPB) of chain links at the chain hawse or stopper, first identified after the premature failures of the Girassol buoy off-loading lines in 2002, in which proof-loaded links develop an interlink sticking moment that induces bending stresses at the crown when the line rotates. The OPB joint industry project led to interlink stiffness models and design guidance later consolidated in BV guidance note NI 604. Wire ropes suffer free bending fatigue at terminations and fretting between wires, while fibre ropes are sensitive to axial compression fatigue and particle ingress.

Quantitative fatigue assessment of chain rests on design T-N curves relating tension range to cycles to failure, derived from full-scale fatigue tests of chain in seawater, or on S-N approaches applied to local stresses obtained from finite element analysis with appropriate stress concentration factors, following the fatigue design conventions established for offshore steel structures generally (DNV GL, 2016). Finite element studies of stud-less link stress fields (Vargas et al., 2004) established the stress concentration factors at the crown, bend and grip regions that underpin local-stress assessment, and demonstrated the strong influence of interlink contact condition on the governing hot-spot. For combined loading, methodologies that superimpose tension-tension and out-of-plane bending stress histories, calibrated against instrumented tests, were developed following the Girassol failures (Lassen et al., 2009) and consolidated through the OPB joint industry project into interlink stiffness formulations and screening procedures (Rampi et al., 2015; Bureau Veritas, 2014). Two features of chain fatigue deserve emphasis in an integrity context: the beneficial compressive residual stresses induced by proof loading, which can be relaxed by service overloads and corrosion, and the sensitivity of fatigue endurance to surface condition, which couples the corrosion state reviewed above directly into remaining fatigue life.

The touch-down or thrash zone concentrates a distinct fatigue-wear interaction. As the vessel responds to waves, the point of first seabed contact migrates along the bottom chain, and links in the affected band experience cyclic bending against the soil, interlink rotation under varying tension, and abrasive contact with sediment; the result is combined wear flats, surface hardening and cracking, and locally elevated corrosion where protective scales are continually removed. Trenching modifies the geometry and can either relieve or intensify the effect, and draught changes or re-tensioning relocate the band onto previously unaffected links. The zone is simultaneously among the least inspectable regions of the system, motivating both the periodic re-positioning of lines to distribute the exposure, where stopper arrangements permit, and the sampling strategy of recovering bottom-chain segments for examination when any line is disturbed for other reasons.

Fatigue of the non-chain components follows different mechanics. Spiral strand wire rope accumulates damage through inter-wire fretting under tension cycling and through free bending at sockets and at any point of restrained curvature, with failure progression by successive wire breaks that may remain hidden beneath sheathing; the failure mechanisms catalogued for wire ropes generally (Chaplin, 1995) translate directly to mooring service. Connectors, shackles, H-links and tri-plates are assessed on an S-N basis with geometric stress concentration factors, and their fatigue performance is sensitive to manufacturing quality, fit-up and the load angle actually experienced in service, which inspection frequently reveals to differ from the design assumption. Polyester rope exhibits high tension-tension fatigue resistance provided minimum tension is maintained, and its qualification and in-service condition assessment are addressed by dedicated standards for offshore fibre ropes (ISO, 2007; DNV GL, 2015, OS-E303) and by classification guidance on fibre rope application in offshore mooring (ABS, 2011), building on the property characterisation established when polyester first entered permanent service (Banfield and Casey, 1998).

3.3 Wear, mechanical damage and manufacturing defects

Interlink wear removes material at the chain grip region in proportion to the product of contact pressure and sliding amplitude, and combines with corrosion so that measured diameter loss frequently reflects both mechanisms. Trawl interaction, dropped objects, installation damage, twist accumulated in wire and chain, and hockling of wire rope constitute mechanical damage categories repeatedly recorded in incident surveys. Manufacturing and material defects, including hydrogen-related cracking in high-strength chain grades and weld defects in accessories, have caused early-life failures, and grade R5 and above chain requires stringent qualification for this reason. Finally, turret-specific degradation includes bearing raceway spalling, wear debris in lubrication systems, bolt preload loss and corrosion of the chain table, all of which are difficult to remediate because the bearing carries the full mooring load and cannot easily be replaced offshore.

The mechanics of interlink wear reward closer attention because they determine where measurement should look. Contact between links occurs over small, highly loaded grip surfaces whose pressure follows line tension and whose sliding follows the relative rotation imposed by vessel motion and line geometry; wear volume scales with their product integrated over time, concentrating loss at the few locations where rotation is systematic, the stopper interface, fairlead or hawse contact points, and the thrash zone, rather than uniformly along the line. Wear flats change the contact geometry as they grow, initially spreading load and slowing the rate, then interacting with corrosion, which roughens and weakens the mating surfaces, in a coupled progression that laboratory studies of either mechanism alone do not capture. For measurement practice the implication is that grip-region dimensions, accessible only when links can be manipulated or recovered, differ systematically from the crown and side dimensions that in-situ tools measure, and assessment should apply location-specific loss rather than a single diameter statistic per link.

3.4 Wire rope, fibre rope, anchors and seabed interaction

Sheathed spiral strand dominates the wire rope population in permanent moorings, its polyethylene jacket excluding seawater and retaining blocking compound; jacket breach, whether by fishing gear, handling damage or abrasion, converts a protected component into a rapidly corroding one, and localised breaches are difficult to find by visual survey. Torque balance matters: chain and wire respond differently to tension-induced twist, and accumulated twist transferred across connectors both accelerates wire deterioration and produces the hockling observed on recovered segments. Requirements for design, manufacture and testing of offshore mooring steel wire ropes are consolidated in DNVGL-OS-E304 (DNV GL, 2015, OS-E304). Fibre rope segments introduce distinct concerns: strength loss from particle ingress in proximity to the seabed, creep and stiffness evolution of polyester under sustained load, axial compression damage if lines go slack, and the impossibility of meaningful visual condition assessment through the jacket, which shifts assurance onto retained test inserts removed and break-tested periodically.

At the seabed, drag embedment anchors, suction piles and driven piles each present integrity questions that inspection can rarely answer directly, since the capacity-generating geometry is buried. Practical surveillance therefore concentrates on indirect evidence: pile inclination and scour at the mudline, chain trenching and its effect on the inverse catenary, and any indication of anchor drag after severe events, assessed by comparing measured line headings and catenary shapes against installation records. Trenching at the touch-down zone, documented on multiple West African and North Sea units, removes soil support, relocates the thrash zone and can markedly change both extreme and fatigue loading of the bottom chain, and its progression is an argument for periodic bathymetric and profile survey along each line corridor as part of the inspection scope.

3.5 Observed failure modes, incidents and statistics
Analyses of recorded incidents consistently attribute the largest shares of line failures to fatigue and corrosion, with significant contributions from mechanical damage and design or manufacturing deficiency, and show that failures concentrate in the top chain and connector regions. Multiple-line failures, though rarer, are disproportionately consequential; documented events include the Gryphon Alpha drift-off in 2011, in which four lines failed in a storm and the vessel lost station with riser rupture, and several tandem incidents in cyclonic and monsoonal basins. These statistics underpin the industry consensus that design conservatism alone has not delivered the intended reliability and that through-life integrity assurance is indispensable.

Individual incidents illustrate the mechanism classes with a clarity that aggregate statistics cannot. The Girassol buoy failures of 2002, in which multiple newly installed top chains failed within months, revealed out-of-plane bending fatigue as a systemic design blind spot and initiated a decade of research that reshaped chain interface design (Jean et al., 2005). The Gryphon Alpha event of February 2011 demonstrated the escalation potential of multiple-line failure: four lines failed in storm conditions, the vessel lost heading control and drove off station, risers were ruptured, and the field remained shut in for a prolonged reconstruction, with total costs reported in the hundreds of millions of pounds. Norwegian continental shelf experience compiled by the regulator (Kvitrud, 2014) recorded repeated single-line failures on production units traced to fatigue at connectors, corrosion-assisted cracking and manufacturing defects, several of which had passed recent inspection, while UK sector reviews prompted dedicated regulator guidance on mooring integrity (Health and Safety Executive, 2013). Across surveys, a consistent minority of failures occurred at or below the touch-down zone where inspection coverage is weakest, and a consistent majority within the top few hundred metres of line, where access is best but load and degradation are also most intense.

Distribution by component type is similarly structured. Common chain links account for the largest absolute number of failures, in proportion to their overwhelming numerical dominance, but connectors and accessory hardware fail at rates per component far above common links, with Kenter-type joining links the most prominent single class in the surveyed record. Wire rope failures concentrate at terminations and at jacket damage sites rather than mid-span. Failures attributed to the turret interface, stopper, hawse and their immediate links, punch above their numerical weight in consequence because they are common-cause candidates: a geometric or procedural condition at the interface applies to every line simultaneously, as Girassol demonstrated. This distribution is directly actionable: it justifies the connector-focused replacement policies many operators adopted, the regulatory disfavour of Kenter links in permanent service, and the concentration of close inspection effort at the interface region despite its small share of total line length.

3.6 Reliability implications of the failure record
The gap between designed and delivered reliability deserves analytical framing because it shapes strategy. Design safety factors address the variability of environment and response around an intact, as-specified system; the recorded failure population, by contrast, is dominated by conditions outside that model, corrosion beyond allowance, fatigue mechanisms absent from the design assessment, manufacturing defects and mechanical damage. Comparative analyses of design requirements against observed failure rates (Smedley and Petruska, 2014) and reliability-based calibration work (Hørte et al., 2017) converge on the conclusion that raising tension safety factors is an inefficient response, since it addresses the loading tail rather than the causes that actually generate failures. The efficient responses are those that shrink the model-reality gap itself: surveillance that measures the true degradation state, monitoring that detects the failures redundancy assumes will be found, qualification that suppresses defect populations, and assessment that includes the mechanisms the record shows to matter. This logic,

implicit throughout the standards development of the 2010s, is the intellectual foundation of the integrity management turn that API RP 2MIM consolidates.

Table 1. Principal degradation mechanisms of FSO turret mooring components, dominant locations, and detectability by conventional inspection.

Mechanism	Most affected components / zones	Governing factors	Detectability by GVI/CVI
Uniform corrosion	Chain, all immersed zones	Temperature, oxygen, salinity, anode condition	Moderate: dimensional trend needed
Pitting / MIC	Chain in warm waters; buried and touch-down zone	Microbial activity, burial, low flow	Poor: cleaning and close measurement required
Tension-tension fatigue	Chain crowns, connectors, wire terminations	Cyclic tension spectrum, corrosion state	Very poor before failure
Out-of-plane bending fatigue	Top links at stopper / hawse	Interlink friction, proof load, vessel motion	Very poor: hidden at interface
Interlink wear	Grip regions, thrash zone links	Contact pressure, relative rotation, abrasives	Poor: grip hidden; measurable when lifted
Mechanical damage / twist	Wire rope, jacketed segments, any lifted line	Fishing, handling, installation, torque imbalance	Moderate for surface damage
Jacket breach and internal corrosion	Sheathed spiral strand	Third-party contact, abrasion	Poor: internal state hidden
Trenching / seabed interaction	Bottom chain, anchors	Soil, line dynamics, currents	Moderate with bathymetric survey
Bearing raceway degradation	Turret main bearing	Load spectrum, lubrication, sealing	Poor: indirect indicators only

Table 2. Selected published mooring integrity incidents relevant to turret-moored FSO/FPSO practice (pre-2019 literature).

Event / finding	Year	Mechanism	Principal lesson
Girassol buoy top-chain failures	2002	Out-of-plane bending fatigue	Interface design can create unassessed fatigue mode
Gryphon Alpha multi-line failure and drift-off	2011	Storm overload after line failures	Escalation potential; heading control loss on turret units
NCS anchor line failures (regulator compilation)	2010-2014	Fatigue, corrosion, defects	Failures recur on inspected lines; detection gap
Industry survey of permanent mooring failures	1997-2012	All mechanisms	Failure rate orders of magnitude above design target
SCORCH recovered-chain findings	2010s	MIC and pitting corrosion	Warm-water corrosion exceeds design allowances
FPS Mooring Integrity JIP findings	2000s	Systemic practice review	Baseline data and records underpin integrity

IV. Inspection Strategies

4.1 Conventional inspection practice

The backbone of current practice is periodic visual inspection executed within class survey cycles, typically annual general visual inspection (GVI) of accessible regions and five-yearly close visual inspection (CVI) of selected components, conducted by remotely operated vehicles (ROVs) supplemented by divers in shallow sections. Inspection scopes commonly include verification of line count and catenary shape, cathodic potential measurements, marine growth assessment, chain dimensional measurement by calliper or photogrammetric tools, examination of connectors and terminations, and inspection of the turret chain table, stoppers and accessible bearing elements. API RP 2I provides guidance for in-service inspection of mooring hardware and defines discard criteria such as allowable diameter reduction, typically in the range of five to ten percent depending on component and operator policy, and allowable crack indications.

Inspection intervals and scopes are anchored in the classification regime. Permanently moored units typically operate under class rules that waive dry-docking in exchange for an approved in-water survey scheme, with annual, intermediate and five-yearly special survey requirements extended to the station-keeping system; the ABS position mooring guide and Bureau Veritas mooring classification rules formalise component-level examination and acceptance criteria within this cycle (ABS, 2018; Bureau Veritas, 2015). A typical five-year programme distributes effort unevenly by design: every line receives a general visual fly-by and catenary verification, a rotating subset receives close visual inspection with cleaning at designated elevations, identified reference links receive repeat dimensional measurement, and the turret interface receives close attention at each opportunity because access is comparatively good and consequence concentration is highest. Campaign practicalities materially affect data quality: vessel-based ROV operations are weather-limited, cleaning to bare metal is slow and often restricted to small windows on each link, and positional repeatability between campaigns, knowing that this year's measurement is of the same link measured five years ago, requires deliberate line marking and record discipline that surveys of operator practice repeatedly find lacking. Campaign execution in the tropical waters where much of the FSO fleet operates also imposes workforce exposure constraints on deck and moonpool activity, for which integrated heat stress risk models developed for industrial operations in extreme environments (Arumosoye and Obriki, 2018a) provide a planning basis.

The division of labour between divers and ROVs is settled mainly by depth, risk policy and task dexterity. Diver intervention retains advantages for cleaning quality, tactile assessment and tooling in the splash zone and upper catenary, at the cost of the offshore industry's most safety-scrutinised work class, and several operators exclude divers from mooring tasks that ROV tooling can perform at all. Work-class ROVs carry the measurement, cleaning and NDE payloads described below and are unconstrained by depth, but station-keeping against surge in the upper water column, precisely where inspection interest concentrates, remains their hardest operating regime, and campaign productivity assumptions should reflect it. Hybrid campaigns that assign the top sections to divers or to crawler tools deployed from the vessel, and the remainder to ROV, recur in the reported practice as the productive compromise, with the additional benefit that surface-deployed crawler measurement of the top chain can proceed independent of dive-support vessel availability.

The scope of inspection should follow the load path beyond the lines themselves. On the vessel side this includes the chain stoppers or hawse structures and their locking devices, the chain table and its welds, turret shaft structure, the accessible races and seals of the main bearing, and the integrity of turret locking systems on disconnectable units. On the seabed side it includes anchor pile heads, subsea connectors and the line corridor, surveyed for trenching, debris and third-party contact evidence. Cathodic protection surveys, potential measurements along the line and at the turret, verify that sacrificial systems continue to polarise the steel, and their degradation trend feeds directly into corrosion projection. Where lines incorporate polyester segments, inspection is largely displaced by the retrieval and break-testing of installed test inserts, since jacketed rope condition cannot be established visually.

4.2 Inspection of the turret system

The turret itself is inspected as structure, mechanism and pressure system simultaneously. Structurally, the chain table, spider and shaft carry the summed mooring load into the hull through welded details whose fatigue classification and inspection follow ship-structural practice: close visual and magnetic particle or ACFM examination of designated hot-spot welds on a survey cycle, with drydock-equivalent scopes executed in situ. Mechanically, the bearing assembly is examined through the surveillance routes of Section 5.3 supplemented at survey by direct measurements: wear-down readings, seal condition, bolt tension sampling on the bearing support, and, on bogie systems, examination of rails and individual bogie change-out condition. The fluid transfer system, swivel stack seals and piping, is inspected under pressure-system rules and matters to the mooring reviewer chiefly through interface loads and the consequences its leakage imposes on access. Chain stoppers and hawse pipes warrant particular attention where OPB exposure exists: witness marks, wear steps and fretting at the latch and seat record the interlink motion actually occurring, and constitute cheap, direct evidence for or against the bending assumptions of the fatigue assessment.

Access drives the practicable scope. Internal turrets place the chain table in a moonpool environment reachable by rope access and staging at calm-weather windows; external turrets expose hardware to bow slamming but simplify over-side access. Several published campaigns used de-manned windows during planned shutdowns to complete scopes impossible during production, and the integrity plan should identify such opportunity scopes in advance so that shutdowns, whenever they occur for other reasons, harvest inspection value. Instrumented verification belongs here too: strain gauging of turret structure against analysis predictions, performed on several units, converts a one-time verification cost into lasting confidence in the load-path model that every subsequent assessment reuses.

4.3 Limitations of visual inspection

The documented limitations of visual inspection are substantial. Marine growth obscures surfaces and its removal is costly and rarely complete; buried and trenched segments in the touch-down zone, statistically a failure hot-spot, are effectively uninspectable without excavation; interlink grip regions where wear and crack initiation occur are hidden by geometry; and detection of fatigue cracks before failure by ROV video is unreliable. Trials reported through mooring integrity joint industry projects have shown that even significant chain damage can be missed at typical ROV standoff distances and water clarity. Consequently, inspection alone provides weak assurance against fatigue-dominated failure modes, and several recorded failures occurred on lines that had recently passed visual inspection.

Cleaning capability sets the ceiling on what close inspection can deliver. Water jetting removes soft growth rapidly but leaves the calcareous bases of hard growth intact; cavitation and abrasive methods reach bare metal at correspondingly lower coverage rates, and the interlink grip region resists all of them from any single approach angle, requiring link manipulation that in-tension chain does not permit. Practical campaigns therefore specify cleaning standard by purpose: to bare metal at reference links destined for dimensional measurement and NDE, to a growth-free but not bare condition for general close visual coverage, and not at all where the survey question is configuration rather than condition. The cleaning effort itself yields data, since growth type, thickness and the corrosion morphology first exposed beneath it are recorded most reliably at the moment of removal, and campaign procedures that assign this recording to the cleaning pass rather than a later inspection pass recover information that is otherwise lost.

These limitations can be framed quantitatively through probability of detection. For welded structures, probability-of-detection curves for common non-destructive evaluation methods are established and underpin risk-based inspection scheduling, but no equivalent published dataset exists for ROV-deployed inspection of mooring chain in service, and trial evidence suggests detection probabilities for cracks and even for substantial section loss are low under realistic marine growth, visibility and standoff conditions. The consequence for integrity strategy is direct: inspection value concentrates where its detection probability is credible, namely dimensional trending of cleaned reference links, close examination of retrieved or lifted components, and verification of gross condition and configuration, while assurance against crack-driven failure must come principally from fatigue assessment, design margin and monitoring rather than from any expectation of finding cracks in situ. Stating this openly in the integrity management plan avoids the false comfort that a completed inspection campaign otherwise invites.

4.4 Inspection data management and reporting
The durable product of an inspection campaign is its data, and the reviewed practice surveys are unanimous that data handling is where value is most often lost. Minimum requirements follow from the uses the data must later serve: link-level identification tied to permanent line marking, so that measurements are comparable across campaigns; calibrated dimensions with stated measurement uncertainty, so that trends can be separated from noise; imagery indexed by position, so that qualitative condition can be revisited; and anomaly records that state the criterion applied, the disposition decided and the closure evidence. Report formats that merely narrate the campaign, without machine-usable measurement tables, have repeatedly forced life-extension projects to re-derive condition from raw video at great cost, or to discard prior campaigns entirely. Because campaigns are executed by contractors whose deliverables outlive the contract, the specification of data format, uncertainty statement and handover belongs in the inspection contract itself, and acceptance of the campaign should be conditional on the data, not only the dive log. Frameworks for cost reduction through contract negotiation and vendor governance (Okonkwo et al., 2019) are pertinent here, since deliverable specification and acceptance criteria are the levers through which an operator secures durable value from contracted inspection services.

4.5 Enhanced and emerging inspection techniques
In response, enhanced techniques have been developed. Laser and stereo-photogrammetric measurement systems mounted on ROVs, such as chain measurement tools deployed in the North Sea, provide link-by-link dimensional mapping with millimetre accuracy and repeatability suitable for corrosion and wear trending. Magnetic particle and alternating current field measurement (ACFM) inspection can be applied underwater to cleaned connectors for crack detection. Magnetic flux leakage and electromagnetic tools for in-situ chain examination, and ultrasonic techniques for accessible accessories, have been trialled with mixed but improving results. For wire rope, magneto-inductive instruments adapted from mine hoist practice can detect broken wires and loss of metallic area through sheathing. Out-of-water inspection, in which a line segment is recovered or lifted to the surface for cleaning, detailed NDE and dimensional survey, remains the highest-quality option and is often integrated with planned component replacement, but its cost restricts it to sampled locations. Risk-based inspection planning, in which inspection scope and interval are set by the criticality and susceptibility of each component rather than by uniform calendar rules, is now endorsed by API RP 2MIM and is increasingly the basis of operator programmes.

The capability profile of each enhanced technique determines its role. Laser and stereo-photogrammetric chain measurement produces three-dimensional link geometry from which minimum diameter, wear flats and elongation are extracted with sub-millimetre repeatability, at production rates of hundreds of links per day in favourable conditions; its output is the corrosion and wear trend on which remaining-section assessment rests. Alternating current field measurement and magnetic particle inspection detect surface-breaking cracks on cleaned connectors and accessories, with ACFM tolerating thin coatings and providing sizing information, but both demand cleaning quality and access that limit them to targeted locations. Magnetic flux leakage tools for chain, deployed as crawler or clamp systems, screen for gross section loss and clustered pitting faster than optical measurement but with coarser resolution, positioning them as wide-area screening ahead of detailed measurement. Magneto-inductive examination of wire rope detects broken wires and loss of metallic area through the jacket, the only practicable window into sheathed rope condition. Ultrasonic thickness and phased-array methods apply to accessible plate and forged items, principally at the turret interface.

Out-of-water inspection deserves separate emphasis because it resets the information baseline. Recovering

© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

a line segment, or de-tensioning and lifting the top chain to the deck, permits full cleaning, calibrated dimensional survey of every link, magnetic particle examination of grip and crown regions, and, where segments are replaced, destructive testing of the removed material: residual breaking load, fatigue endurance and metallographic examination. Programmes that couple planned top-chain replacement with laboratory testing of the recovered chain convert a maintenance action into the highest-quality condition data available, calibrating the corrosion-fatigue models used for the remaining lines; published testing of used North Sea chain demonstrates both the feasibility and the value of this approach (Gabrielsen et al., 2017). The principal constraints are operational, since de-tensioning a line redistributes load to its neighbours and the operation itself must be engineered against the temporarily degraded mooring condition.

Table 3. Inspection techniques for turret mooring systems: role, strengths and limitations.

Technique	Primary role	Strengths	Limitations
General visual (ROV)	Configuration and gross condition	Full-line coverage, low cost per metre	Low detection capability; growth obscures
Close visual + cleaning	Local condition at selected points	Surface detail, CP verification	Slow; small coverage; grip hidden
Laser / photogrammetric measurement	Dimensional trending	Sub-mm repeatability; link-by-link data	Cleaning and stable positioning needed
ACFM / MPI (subsea)	Crack detection on accessories	Surface crack detection and sizing (ACFM)	Cleaning quality; access; local only
Magnetic flux leakage (chain)	Screening for section loss	Faster wide-area coverage	Coarser resolution; calibration
Magneto-inductive (wire rope)	Internal wire condition	Sees through jacket; LMA and broken wires	Interpretation; terminations difficult
Bathymetric / profile survey	Seabed interaction	Trenching and catenary verification	Indirect for component condition
Out-of-water examination	Baseline reset; testing	Full NDE and destructive test possible	Cost; line out of service; engineering

V. MONITORING STRATEGIES

5.1 Line load and integrity monitoring

Continuous monitoring addresses the central weakness of periodic inspection, namely the inability to detect rapid degradation or discrete failure between surveys. A sobering finding of industry surveys is that a number of single-line failures remained undetected for weeks or months until a subsequent inspection, during which time the system operated with degraded redundancy. Direct tension monitoring using load cells or instrumented chain stoppers in the turret provides the most information-rich measurement, supporting fatigue accounting and failure alarms, but in-turret load cells have historically shown poor reliability and are difficult to retrofit and calibrate. Inclination-based systems, which measure chain angle at the top segment using subsea inclinometers or motion sensors and infer tension from the catenary solution, offer a retrofittable alternative with acceptable accuracy for trending, and have been widely deployed in the North Sea. Sonar-based systems scan the expected positions of mooring lines from hull- or turret-mounted heads and raise alarms on line displacement or disappearance, providing robust line-presence detection independent of instrumentation on the line itself.

Implementation detail governs the value of each approach. Load measurement at the stopper, by instrumented pins, strain-gauged load cells or fibre-optic sensing, captures the full tension spectrum needed for fatigue accounting, but the sensing

© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

element sits in a corrosive, high-load, difficult-access location, and industry experience of early installations recorded high failure fractions within a few years; designs emphasising replaceability and calibration checkability have improved but not eliminated this attrition. Inclinometer systems clamp motion sensor pods to the top chain and convert measured declination, with water depth and line properties, into tension through the catenary equations; their accuracy degrades as lines approach taut conditions and they measure at one point only, but they retrofit without breaking the load path and their failure is evident rather than silent. Sonar monitoring from turret- or hull-mounted heads verifies the presence and position of each line in the water column continuously, and its detection logic, a line missing from its expected bearing, is robust to the sensor drift that afflicts quantitative measurements. Layering these approaches, continuous line-presence detection plus tension or angle measurement on a subset of lines, has emerged as the pragmatic architecture on retrofitted units.

Sensing technology choices within these architectures continued to evolve through the review period. Fibre-optic strain measurement, embedded in instrumented stopper pins or bonded to accessible structure, offers immunity to the electrical faults that dominate conventional load cell failures and multiplexes many channels on one cable, at the price of specialised interrogation hardware. Subsea pods communicate by acoustic link or by cabled connection to the turret; acoustic telemetry eases installation but rations bandwidth, so pods typically process raw motion data locally and transmit statistics, with raw records recovered at battery change. Battery endurance of three to five years set the practical service interval of clamp-on systems in the reported deployments, aligning sensor maintenance with planned inspection campaigns. Redundant, dissimilar measurement of the most safety-critical function, line-failure detection, remained the consistent recommendation across system vendors and operator experience alike, precisely because every individual technology class had by 2019 accumulated a documented failure history.

5.2 Position-based and indirect monitoring

Vessel position monitoring using differential GNSS, combined with heading and draught data, enables detection of mooring failure through changes in the vessel excursion envelope and equilibrium offset. Because a turret-moored vessel weathervanes, single-line failure may produce only subtle changes in watch circle statistics; consequently, data-driven approaches have been developed that train statistical or machine-learning models on position, heading and environmental data to classify intact versus damaged conditions. Studies published in the years preceding this review demonstrated detection of simulated line failures from GNSS data alone with promising reliability, and such position-based failure detection is attractive because the sensors are inexpensive, topside and easily maintained. Environmental monitoring by wave radar, anemometry and current profilers supports the reconstruction of load histories for fatigue accounting, and integrated hull-riser-mooring monitoring systems increasingly combine these data streams in a single historian.

Position-based detection merits elaboration because it is the least invasive option. A turret-moored vessel under a given environment adopts an equilibrium offset and heading determined by the mooring stiffness; failure of a line softens the system asymmetrically, shifting the mean offset and altering the low-frequency response statistics. Detection algorithms therefore compare measured GNSS position and heading against either a calibrated numerical model of the intact system or a statistical envelope learned from historical data, flagging excursions inconsistent with the intact configuration. Published studies in the years before this review reported reliable discrimination of simulated single-line failures within tens of minutes under moderate environments, with weaker performance in benign conditions where mooring loads, and hence the signature of their change, are small. The approach requires disciplined maintenance of the reference model as draught, riser configuration and marine growth evolve, and it localises the failed line only coarsely, so it functions best as an alerting layer that triggers targeted ROV or sonar verification.

Metocean measurement completes the monitoring architecture. Wave radar or buoys, anemometers and current profilers provide the environmental record against which measured responses are interpreted and from which load histories are reconstructed for lines without direct measurement. Hindcast-model environments can substitute where instruments fail, but comparisons repeatedly show site measurements diverging from regional hindcasts in exactly the conditions that matter for fatigue, short-period seas and current shear, arguing for maintained local measurement on units whose life extension will one day depend on a defensible load history. Time synchronisation across position, tension, angle and environment channels, mundane as it appears, determines whether the dataset can later support response reconstruction, and is worth specifying explicitly in monitoring system requirements.

Where direct tension records do not exist, reconstruction proceeds by driving the calibrated vessel-mooring model with the best available environmental history, measured where possible, hindcast otherwise, and computing component tension histories from which damage is integrated. The credibility of the result rests on three validations: the model reproduces measured vessel offsets and headings for periods where position records exist; computed tensions match any direct measurements, even short-duration campaign measurements installed for the purpose; and sensitivity cases bound the items of Section 2.6 that measurement cannot pin down. Reconstruction of this kind, executed for life-extension assessments in the published record, has shifted computed fatigue lives in both directions relative to design, and its principal vulnerability is undocumented configuration history, periods of changed draught, missing lines or altered pretension that no model can recover if they were not recorded, returning once more to the primacy of records.

5.3 Turret and bearing monitoring

For the turret itself, condition monitoring practice borrows from rotating machinery: bearing condition is tracked through rotation torque or bogie load measurements, vibration and acoustic emission sensing, grease debris analysis, and periodic raceway wear-down surveys. Structural monitoring of the turret casing and its hull interface by strain gauging has been implemented on several units to validate design load transfer models. Because turret bearing replacement offshore is at the limit of feasibility, early detection of raceway degradation and preservation of lubrication and sealing systems are treated as high-priority integrity tasks.

A structured bearing surveillance programme combines continuous and periodic elements. Continuously, rotation resistance is observable through the heading behaviour of the vessel itself, since a degrading bearing manifests as stick-slip weathervaning and heading offsets under light environments, and bogie or axle loads on rail-type systems can be instrumented directly. Periodically, grease sampling and debris analysis indicate raceway and roller wear; wear-down measurements at defined circumferential stations, taken against installation datums, quantify race settlement; and borescope access ports, where fitted, permit direct raceway viewing. Seal condition determines water ingress, the dominant accelerator of raceway damage, so seal inspection and replacement scheduling belongs in the integrity plan rather than the general maintenance backlog. For bogie and rail arrangements, individual bogie replacement offshore is feasible and the surveillance aim is to catch rail damage early; for three-race roller bearings, offshore replacement approaches the limit of feasibility, and the surveillance aim is to slow degradation and to inform the timing of major intervention.

5.4 Data management and predictive analytics

Across all monitoring modalities, the value delivered depends on data quality management, sensor reliability and the analytical layer that converts measurements into integrity decisions. Reported industry experience indicates high attrition of subsea sensors and frequent data gaps, arguing for redundancy and for analytics that are tolerant of missing data. Digital-twin approaches, in which a calibrated numerical model of the vessel and mooring is driven by measured environment and position to estimate line tensions and accumulated fatigue in near real time, emerged in the late 2010s as a means of converting inexpensive measurements into component-level integrity estimates, and constitute one of the most active development areas identified in this review.

Alarm philosophy converts monitoring into safety function. A line-failure detection layer should alarm on line absence or gross geometry change with high availability and a tested response procedure, including load-reduction actions such as offloading suspension, heading management and preparation for shuttle tanker stand-off. Trend surveillance layers, tension statistics, angle drift, corrosion rate, bearing indicators, feed periodic integrity review rather than control-room alarms, and their value depends on assigned ownership: surveys of practice repeatedly find monitoring data accumulating unexamined because no role is accountable for its review. Key performance indicators that operators have adopted include monitoring channel availability, time-to-detection in periodic line-failure drills using simulated signals, closure time of integrity anomalies, and the currency of the calibrated response model. Cyber and data governance of monitoring systems, though beyond this review's scope, becomes integrity-relevant as soon as operational decisions rely on the data stream; security audit and enterprise risk assessment frameworks for resilient information systems (Dosunmu and Ogundele, 2019) supply the assurance structure that monitoring architectures of this criticality warrant.

5.5 Deployment experience and system selection

Reported deployment experience through the 2010s supports several selection heuristics. Retrofit projects on North Sea units favoured inclinometer and sonar combinations precisely because they avoid breaking the load path, and reported multi-year survival of clamp-mounted subsea pods where earlier in-line load cells had failed; new-build turrets increasingly specified instrumented stoppers from the outset, where integration and calibration can be engineered rather than improvised. GNSS-based analytics found earliest adoption on units where subsea retrofit was cost-prohibitive, functioning as the first monitoring layer rather than the last. Across all system types, the reported determinants of sustained value were unglamorous: spares and repair strategy for subsea sensors, a named onshore owner of the data, integration of alarms into the control room with drilled responses, and periodic end-to-end tests. Systems procured as capital projects and left without an operating budget converged on the same fate regardless of technology, functional at handover and silent within a few years.

Selection should be driven by the failure modes the system is accountable for detecting. If the governing risk is undetected line failure, sonar or position analytics with tested alarms address it directly and cheaply. If the extension case will depend on experienced fatigue, tension or angle measurement on representative lines, with maintained metocean measurement, is the requirement, and it must run for years before the assessment needs it, which argues for early installation. If the bearing is the critical item, the surveillance programme of Section 5.3 takes priority. Stating the accountability explicitly, this system exists to detect X within Y with availability Z, disciplines both procurement and operation, and gives internal audit something checkable.

Data architecture choices made at installation echo for decades. The reviewed deployment experience favours storing raw measurement streams, not only derived statistics, in an open, documented format under operator rather than vendor custody, because analytical methods improve across a unit's life and reprocessing of raw history has repeatedly recovered value that contemporary processing missed, notably in retrospective fatigue accounting for life extension. Channel metadata, sensor identity, calibration history, mounting position, datum definitions, determines whether a record made in one decade is interpretable in the next, and its maintenance is a documentation task no more glamorous and no less essential than the line marking that anchors inspection trending. Where vendors provide analytics as a service, escrow of algorithms and data formats protects against the commercial mortality of suppliers over a thirty-year horizon, a hazard the FSO fleet's history amply demonstrates. Conceptual work on legal and ethical risk modelling in enterprise data protection governance (Mbonu et al., 2018) is relevant to the custody and transfer of such records across ownership changes, while architectures for enterprise log analytics and automated incident response (Mbonu et al., 2019) illustrate the event-handling patterns that continuously monitored systems of this kind eventually require.

Integration with the unit's wider monitoring estate multiplies the value of each element. Hull structural monitoring supplies the motions and, where fitted, the bending and acceleration records that validate the vessel side of the coupled model; riser and umbilical monitoring shares the turret data infrastructure and often the same environmental sensors; and machinery historians carry the draught, ballast and offloading records that constitute configuration history. Deployments reviewed in the period literature that unified these streams in a single time-synchronised historian reported disproportionate benefit for exactly the reconstruction and anomaly-interpretation tasks this review has emphasised, because the analyst confronted one coherent dataset rather than several partial ones with incompatible clocks and custodians. The integration cost is modest at new-build and substantial as retrofit, one more argument for treating monitoring architecture as a design deliverable of the same standing as the mooring hardware itself.

Table 4. Monitoring approaches for turret mooring integrity: measurement, detection capability and principal weaknesses.

Approach	Measures	Line-failure detection	Fatigue accounting value	Principal weakness
Stopper load cells / instrumented pins	Tension time series	Immediate on monitored lines	High	Sensor attrition; retrofit difficulty
Top-chain inclinometers	Chain angle (tension inferred)	Good on monitored lines	Moderate	Single point; taut-line accuracy
Sonar line tracking	Line presence / position	High, all lines	None	No load information
GNSS position + heading analytics	Vessel offset statistics	Moderate; environment-dependent	Indirect via model	Model upkeep; coarse localisation
Metocean sensors	Wave, wind, current	Supporting only	High (reconstruction)	Instrument survival
Digital twin reconstruction	Model-based tensions	Supporting	High if calibrated	Validation burden
Bearing condition monitoring	Torque, loads, debris, wear-down	n/a	n/a (bearing life)	Indirect indicators

VI. INTEGRITY MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORKS AND STANDARDS

Design standards for station-keeping, principally API RP 2SK, ISO 19901-7 and DNVGL-OS-E301, define environmental criteria, safety factors for intact and damaged conditions, and fatigue design requirements, and thereby set the baseline against which in-service condition is judged. In-service requirements were historically fragmentary, distributed among class rules, API RP 2I inspection guidance and regulator expectations such as those issued by the UK HSE following mooring failure reviews and by the Petroleum Safety Authority Norway. The joint industry projects on Floating Production System Mooring Integrity, whose findings were summarised by Brown et al. (2005) and subsequent phases, catalogued incident experience and articulated the elements of a mooring integrity management (MIM) programme.

API RP 2MIM, first issued in 2019, consolidates this material into a management-system framework aligned with API RP 2FSIM and 2SIM for floating and fixed structures. Its process comprises data collection and surveillance, condition evaluation, assessment of fitness for service, and the development of inspection, monitoring and mitigation plans, executed under a risk-based philosophy in which the rigour of each activity is proportionate to the probability and consequence of failure. It provides guidance on anomaly criteria, on the use of monitoring in lieu of or in supplement to inspection, and on assessment triggers such as changes of use, life extension and damage discovery. Class societies operate complementary schemes through which mooring condition is tied to the unit's classification, and DNVGL, ABS and Bureau Veritas have each issued guidance for mooring integrity and for the assessment of ageing units. The practical challenge repeatedly identified in surveys of operator practice is not the absence of frameworks but the completeness of baseline data, the continuity of records across ownership changes, and the closure of the loop between monitoring data and maintenance decisions.

Regional regulatory regimes add a further layer. In the United Kingdom, the safety case regime places mooring integrity within the duty holder's demonstration of risk management, supported by targeted guidance issued after sector failure reviews (Health and Safety Executive, 2013) and by Oil & Gas UK mooring integrity guidance developed with industry (Oil & Gas UK, 2008); regulator inspection campaigns in the 2010s examined operator mooring integrity arrangements directly. In Norway, the facilities and activities regulations invoke NORSOK and DNVGL standards, and the Petroleum Safety Authority has published failure compilations and followed up recurring causes with industry (Kvitrud, 2014). Other basins commonly anchor requirements in class rules supplemented by field-specific regulator conditions. The practical consequence for an FSO operator is that the integrity management system must serve several masters simultaneously, class, flag, coastal state regulator and internal assurance, and efficiency argues for a single integrated plan mapped once against each authority's expectations rather than parallel compliance documents.

Within the management system itself, three elements deserve emphasis beyond the framework outline given above. Anomaly criteria, the quantitative thresholds that convert an observation into an action, should be defined in advance for each surveillance channel: diameter reduction bands triggering increased measurement frequency, engineering assessment or replacement planning; angle or tension drift limits; bearing wear-down limits. Management of change discipline must capture alterations with mooring consequence that originate elsewhere, draught range changes, riser additions, offloading pattern changes, since these silently invalidate the load basis of the integrity assessment. And records must be structured for the decades-long horizon: the finding that baseline and historical data are missing at the point of life extension recurs in every survey of practice, and is cheap to prevent and expensive to cure.

Table 5. Illustrative anomaly criteria structure for turret mooring surveillance channels (values are set per unit by engineering assessment).

Surveillance channel	Level 1 (increase surveillance)	Level 2 (engineering assessment)	Level 3 (intervention planning)
Chain diameter at reference links	Loss beyond projected trend band	Loss approaching assessed fatigue margin	Loss at replacement criterion
Local pitting depth	New pitting cluster identified	Pit depth exceeding assessment basis	Pitting invalidating fatigue case
Line tension / angle statistics	Drift beyond seasonal envelope	Offset inconsistent with intact model	Line failure signature
Cathodic potential	Trend toward protection limit	Below protection potential locally	Systemic under-protection
Bearing wear-down	Measurable change from datum	Rate increase between surveys	Approach to design wear limit
Growth thickness	Beyond design profile	Hydrodynamic basis exceeded	Load management required

Assessment triggers and assurance activity complete the framework. API RP 2MIM identifies conditions requiring fitness-for-service assessment, discovered damage or anomaly beyond criteria, exposure to an event beyond the design basis, changes of use or configuration, and life extension, and the integrity plan should pre-assign the analysis level each trigger invokes, from screening checks against documented margins to full re-analysis. Assurance operates at two levels: verification that the plan is being executed, campaigns completed, anomalies dispositioned, monitoring available, and validation that the plan remains the right one, revisited when incident experience, industry findings or system changes alter the risk picture. Independent review has proven its worth in the published record chiefly by catching the quiet degradations of process, lapsed reference-link measurement, uncalibrated response models, monitoring alarms disabled and forgotten, rather than by re-deriving engineering results. Technology-enabled risk assessment approaches to internal audit quality (Akomolafe and Agu, 2018) are directly transferable to this verification role, where the audit object is increasingly a data stream rather than a document.

The philosophical differences among the principal standards are modest but operationally relevant. API RP 2SK and ISO 19901-7 employ a working stress format with explicit factors per analysis condition, transparent to hand verification and dominant in the basins where most FSOs operate; DNVGL-OS-E301 employs a partial safety factor format calibrated by structural reliability analysis to differentiated consequence classes, which adapts more gracefully to novel configurations but couples the user to the calibration assumptions. For fatigue, the API and ISO documents reference T-N practice while DNVGL provides both T-N and S-N routes with specified curves; for reassessment of degraded systems, none of the design codes provides direct provisions, and API RP 2MIM fills the gap procedurally, by defining assessment triggers and expectations, while leaving methods to the engineer. In practice, extension projects assemble a hybrid basis, design-code factors, JIP-derived methods for OPB and corroded-chain fatigue, and class acceptance, and documenting that basis explicitly, method by method with its provenance, has proven the difference between smooth and contested requalification.

Beyond the North Sea regimes discussed above, coastal states hosting large FSO populations administer requirements chiefly through class delegation supplemented by field-level conditions, and the review period saw regulators in several basins issue mooring-specific expectations following regional incidents. For operators, the material point is less any single document than the trajectory common to all of them: from prescriptive periodic survey toward demonstrated, risk-based, data-supported integrity management, with the burden of demonstration resting on the operator's records. The regimes reward, in reduced intervention and smoother requalification, exactly the practices this review has identified as technically warranted, which aligns the compliance and engineering cases for investment in surveillance and data quality. Where FSOs operate under developing regulatory regimes, adaptive safety management system implementation models formulated for such contexts in other transport and infrastructure sectors (Adeyelu, 2019) are instructive on sequencing capability development ahead of prescriptive requirement.

Organisationally, the management frameworks converge on a small set of defined roles whatever titles individual operators use: an accountable integrity engineer who owns the plan, the anomaly register and the assessment triggers; a surveillance data owner responsible for monitoring availability and periodic review; marine and operations interfaces through whom draught, offloading and configuration changes reach the integrity process; and an independent verification function, internal or class-delegated, that audits execution. Surveys of practice find the first and second roles most frequently unfilled in substance, present on the organisation chart but without allocated time, and identify this, more than any technical gap, as the proximate cause of surveillance data accumulating unreviewed. The corrective is administrative rather than technical, which is precisely why standards drafted by engineers historically under-specified it and why API RP 2MIM's management-system framing represents genuine progress.

© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

Table 6. Principal standards and guidance for FSO turret mooring design and integrity management (pre-2020).

Document	Scope	Role in integrity assurance
API RP 2SK (2005/2008)	Stationkeeping design and analysis	Design basis; safety factors; assessment reference
ISO 19901-7 (2013)	Stationkeeping systems	International design baseline
DNVGL-OS-E301/E302/E303/E304	Position mooring; chain; fibre and wire ropes	Component requirements; reliability-calibrated factors
API RP 2I (2015)	In-service inspection of mooring hardware	Inspection methods; discard criteria
API RP 2MIM (2019)	Mooring integrity management	Management framework; surveillance; assessment triggers
API RP 2FPS (2011)	Floating production systems	System-level design and interfaces
ABS Position Mooring Guide (2018); BV NR 493 (2015)	Classification of mooring systems	Survey regimes; class acceptance criteria
BV NI 604 (2014)	Chain OPB/IPB fatigue	Interface fatigue assessment method
HSE IS 4/2013; Oil & Gas UK (2008)	Regulator and industry guidance	In-service expectations; lessons from failures

VII. LIFE-EXTENSION STRATEGIES

7.1 Assessment methodology

Life extension of an FSO turret mooring system is fundamentally an exercise in demonstrating that the as-is system, with credible projections of continuing degradation, satisfies acceptable safety criteria for the extension period. The assessment typically proceeds through collation of design, fabrication, installation and in-service records; condition assessment by targeted inspection and measurement campaigns, including recovered-component testing where possible; re-analysis of the mooring under updated metocean criteria and measured component condition, addressing both ultimate and fatigue limit states; and a gap-closure plan combining component replacement, enhanced monitoring and revised operating limits. Updated metocean criteria matter because many older FSOs were designed to environmental datasets that have since been revised, in some basins upward.

Sequencing the assessment matters. Experience reported from extension projects favours an initial screening phase that identifies the binding constraints early, often fatigue at the chain interface, corrosion in specific zones or a single component class, so that the expensive elements of the campaign, out-of-water testing, extensive re-analysis, procurement of replacement components with long lead times, are targeted rather than general. Screening draws on the anomaly history, the highest-value inspection data (dimensional trends on reference links), and a re-run of the design-basis analysis under current metocean criteria; where screening shows comfortable margins in most components, the extension case concentrates on the few that govern. Alignment with the class society and regulator at the screening stage, on assessment methodology, acceptance criteria and the evidential standard expected, prevents the late-stage disputes that have delayed published extension projects.

Metocean re-derivation is worth separating as an assessment input because it moves the goalposts for every other calculation. Extension assessments should procure a current site-specific criteria study, developed to the metocean conventions of ISO 19901-1 (ISO, 2015), rather than reuse the design-era document, for three reasons evidenced in the period literature: hindcast databases and analysis methods improved materially between the design of the older fleet and 2019, revising extremes in either direction; measured data accumulated on or near many fields, permitting calibration unavailable at design; and response-based criteria derivation, selecting environmental combinations by the response they produce rather than by marginal probabilities of

© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

wind, wave and current separately, frequently relieves the artificial conservatism of design-era combination rules for weathervaning units. Where re-derived criteria increase demands, better to discover it at screening than at requalification; where they relieve demands, the relief is legitimate margin that the extension case is entitled to claim.

7.2 Residual fatigue and corrosion assessment

Residual fatigue assessment must reconcile calculated damage with the actual load history, which is rarely fully known. Where monitoring data exist, measured tensions or reconstructed tension histories from hindcast environments and calibrated models are used to re-compute accumulated damage; where they do not, conservative hindcast-based reconstruction is standard. Assessment must include mechanisms omitted from the original design where relevant, notably OPB fatigue at chain stoppers and the interaction of corrosion pitting with fatigue, for which knock-down factors on T-N curves or fracture-mechanics crack-growth approaches are applied. Corrosion projection for the extension period should be based on measured site-specific rates from dimensional trending rather than generic allowances, given the documented exceedances in warm waters. Testing of chain segments recovered from service, as reported in several North Sea and West African campaigns, provides the strongest calibration of both residual strength and fatigue endurance, and has repeatedly shown that heavily corroded chain retains less fatigue life than nominal-diameter calculations suggest.

The treatment of measured degradation in re-analysis requires method choices that should be made explicitly. Strength reassessment of corroded and worn chain can proceed on minimum measured section with conventional capacity formulas, or on measured geometry with finite element analysis where wear flats and pit fields interact; break tests of recovered links calibrate whichever route is chosen, and published test programmes on used chain report residual strength generally consistent with minimum-section calculation but fatigue endurance falling below curves entered at nominal dimensions, confirming that fatigue, not static strength, usually governs the extension case (Gabrielsen et al., 2017). Fatigue reassessment should propagate the measured corrosion state into the endurance model, through knock-down factors on T-N curves for pitted surfaces or through fracture mechanics with initial flaw sizes set by observed pit depths, and should add the interface bending mechanism wherever the stopper geometry permits interlink moment transfer, using the stiffness formulations of the OPB project (Rampi et al., 2015; Lassen et al., 2009). Where monitoring has produced measured tension or reconstructed response histories, damage accounting can replace the design spectrum with the experienced one; both surpluses and deficits relative to design have been reported, and the direction is not predictable in advance.

Acceptance criteria for the extension period require explicit agreement because the design codes do not state them for degraded systems. Common practice in the published record retains the design-code tension safety factors applied to capacities computed on measured minimum sections, treats projected corrosion over the extension period as a further section reduction in the governing checks, and applies fatigue safety factors on remaining life that reflect inspectability, higher where a component cannot be monitored or inspected, sometimes reduced where monitoring provides measured load history and prompt failure detection. That last trade, margin against measurement, is the quantitative expression of the integrity strategy argued throughout this review, and making it explicitly, with the class society's concurrence, converts monitoring investment into accepted analytical relief rather than unacknowledged conservatism.

7.3 Remediation and requalification

Practical life-extension measures include replacement of top-chain segments and connectors, which concentrate damage and are the most accessible components; insertion of new segments using subsea connectors; re-tensioning and line management to redistribute wear points in the thrash zone; upgrading of anodes and application of corrosion mitigation; refurbishment of chain stoppers and hawse pipes to address OPB; and, where the turret bearing is degraded, lubrication system renewal, load-path modification or in extreme cases bearing replacement campaigns. Requalification is concluded through updated documentation, revised inspection and monitoring plans reflecting the assessed condition, and acceptance by the class society and regulator. Several published case histories demonstrate extensions of ten years or more achieved through combinations of partial line replacement and monitoring upgrades at a fraction of the cost of full mooring renewal.

Replacement engineering has its own integrity dimension. Top-chain renewal requires de-tensioning and disconnection at the stopper, temporary line handling under vessel, and reconnection with new components whose specification should reflect the lessons of the service period: upgraded stopper and hawse geometry where OPB exposure was found, corrosion allowance and grade selection informed by measured site rates, and connector types with established fatigue performance in place of any Kenter links remaining in the system. The operation is performed on a live mooring system, so each line outage must be assessed as a temporary damaged condition, scheduled against weather windows and offloading, and sequenced so that adjacent lines are not simultaneously degraded. Component procurement deserves early attention because chain of the required grade and certification carries long manufacture lead times, and because qualification testing of high-grade chain, including hydrogen embrittlement controls, is itself a schedule item; supply chain risk management models developed for engineering, procurement and construction and gas processing projects (Agbabiaka et al., 2019) address precisely the lead-time and supplier-qualification exposures that determine whether a replacement campaign meets its weather window. Finally, every replacement campaign should be exploited for data: the removed components are the ground truth against which the next decade of surveillance of the remaining lines will be calibrated.

7.4 Fibre rope segments and disconnectable systems

Where extension involves polyester segments, the assessment logic shifts from measured degradation to qualified endurance. Jacketed rope condition cannot be usefully inspected in situ, so the extension case rests on the original qualification, the service tension history relative to the qualified envelope, particularly minimum tension maintenance against axial compression damage, and the periodic destructive testing of retained inserts; where inserts were not installed, recovery and testing of a segment, or replacement with an inserted test protocol for the extension period, are the available remedies. Disconnectable turret systems add their own items: the connector and its locking mechanism accumulate wear per connection cycle, buoy structures carry their own fatigue and corrosion assessments, and the disconnect operation itself, the system's defining safety function, warrants periodic demonstration under controlled conditions, since a mechanism proven only at installation cannot be credited decades later without evidence.

7.5 Economics and the extension decision

Published extension experience allows the decision structure, if not universal numbers, to be stated. The cost of the assessment and surveillance programme is modest against the alternatives; the material costs concentrate in component replacement and the vessel time to execute it, and the dominant financial variable is usually deferred or avoided production rather than hardware. Three features recur in the reported economics. First, options have value: monitoring installed early, and records maintained continuously, are cheap insurance that preserves the extension option even if the decision is years away, whereas their absence forces either conservatism or expensive reconstruction of the condition case. Second, partial replacement dominates full renewal wherever assessment can discriminate component condition, which is precisely what dimensional trending and recovered-component testing enable; published campaigns replacing top chain and connectors while re-qualifying the remainder report costs at a small fraction of full mooring renewal. Third, the binding constraint is often schedule, chain manufacture lead time and weather-window availability, so the assessment should begin earlier than financial optimisation alone would suggest.

7.6 Synthesis of published extension experience

Although confidentiality limits the published detail of individual projects, the extension case histories reported through the 2010s, North Sea FPSOs re-certified beyond twenty-five years, West African FSOs extended in warm-water corrosion environments, and units re-deployed to new fields with mooring reuse assessments, exhibit convergent anatomy. In each, the governing components proved to be a small subset, top chain, specific connector types, or interface links with OPB exposure; measured condition data existed for some components and had to be reconstructed or conservatively bounded for others, at visible cost; replacement of the governing subset plus surveillance upgrades delivered the extension; and the requalified system carried a revised integrity plan with tightened trending obligations. Re-deployment cases add a distinctive lesson: components recovered, examined and re-certified for reuse generated exactly the fleet-condition data that in-service programmes struggle to obtain, and several operators fed those findings back into inspection criteria for sister units.

The negative experience is equally instructive. Extension attempts reported as abandoned or drastically restructured trace to a recognisable set of causes: absent baseline records that forced worst-case assumptions; corrosion beyond any recoverable margin in warm-water top chain, discovered late; interface fatigue mechanisms outside the original design basis whose retrospective assessment could not demonstrate adequacy; and, organisationally, assessments begun too close to certificate expiry for replacement manufacture and installation to complete. Every one of these causes is preventable by actions taken years earlier, records discipline, site-rate corrosion trending, interface review against post-Girassol knowledge, and early screening, which is the strongest practical argument this review can offer for treating life extension not as a project that begins near end of design life but as a property of how the mooring system is managed from installation onward.

Table 7. Life-extension workflow for an FSO turret mooring system: stages, principal activities and outputs.

Stage	Principal activities	Outputs
Records collation	Assemble design basis, certificates, installation and inspection history, incident and anomaly records	Data register; gap list
Screening assessment	Re-run design checks with current metocean; review trends against criteria	Governing components; assessment plan
Condition campaign	Targeted measurement, NDE, recovery and testing of components; CP survey; bathymetry	Measured condition with uncertainty
Re-analysis	ULS/ALS on measured sections; fatigue with corrosion and OPB; experienced-load damage where measured	Fitness-for-service statement per component
Gap closure	Component replacement engineering; monitoring upgrades; revised operating limits	Remediation plan and execution
Requalification	Class and regulator acceptance; revised inspection, monitoring and anomaly plans	Extended certification; updated IM plan

VIII. DISCUSSION AND RESEARCH GAPS

Three findings recur across the literature reviewed. First, the failure statistics demonstrate that the dominant threats, fatigue and corrosion in their site-specific and interacting forms, are precisely those least detectable by the visual inspection regimes on which assurance has traditionally relied; integrity strategies weighted toward continuous monitoring and quantitative dimensional trending are therefore better matched to the actual risk profile. Second, redundancy assumptions in design are only valid if line failures are detected promptly, which elevates line-failure detection, whether by tension, inclination, sonar or position-based analytics, to a primary safety function rather than an optional enhancement. Third, life extension is tractable where baseline records, measured condition data and load histories exist, and expensive where they do not, which argues for instituting integrity data management from the start of service life rather than at the point of extension.

A further cross-cutting observation is that mooring integrity management is executed within the wider safety management environment of the installation and its contractors. Conceptual modelling of data-driven occupational safety risk control in large-scale energy infrastructure projects (Obriki and Arumosoye, 2018) anticipates the same trajectory identified in Section 5 for the mooring system itself, in which continuously collected data displaces periodic observation as the basis of risk control. The anomaly-reporting element of a mooring integrity programme is functionally analogous to near-miss and hazard observation reporting in occupational safety, and the finding that such precursor data are chronically under-utilised in industrial safety management (Arumosoye and Obriki, 2019) mirrors the under-use of inspection and monitoring records identified in mooring surveys. The effectiveness of integrity programmes also depends on visible management commitment and workforce engagement; frameworks linking management safety walkthrough frequency and coverage to safety culture outcomes in mega projects (Obriki and Arumosoye, 2019) and accounts of leadership-driven safety culture transformation in large workforces (Obogo et al., 2019b) are relevant to the offshore inspection and maintenance campaigns through which mooring integrity work is delivered.

Significant research gaps remain. Prognostic models for microbially influenced and pitting corrosion of chain remain immature relative to their importance, and the coupling between pitting morphology and fatigue crack initiation is an open quantitative problem. Fatigue of degraded chain, combining wear-modified interlink contact, corrosion loss and OPB, lacks validated design curves. The reliability of indirect, position-based failure detection under the full range of environments and failure locations requires further field validation, as does the accuracy of digital-twin tension reconstruction for fatigue accounting. Standardised probability-of-detection data for subsea NDE of mooring components, analogous to those available for welded structures, would allow risk-based inspection to be placed on a firmer quantitative footing. Finally, human and organisational factors, including data continuity across asset transfers, are repeatedly implicated in integrity shortfalls and merit systematic treatment.

A fourth theme concerns the complementarity, rather than competition, of inspection and monitoring. Monitoring detects change rapidly but interprets it against a model; inspection observes the physical article but infrequently and with limited detection capability. The combinations that the reviewed experience endorses exploit each to cover the other's blindness: dimensional trending calibrates the corrosion state that monitoring cannot see; monitored tensions validate the load model that inspection findings are assessed against; sonar or position analytics guarantee the prompt failure detection that inspection intervals cannot; and out-of-water testing periodically grounds the whole assessment in destructively verified truth. Integrity plans written as an inspection schedule with monitoring appended, or the reverse, forfeit this structure; plans written from the failure modes outward, asking for each credible mode which combination of measures provides detection or margin, arrive at it naturally. The wider proposition that routinely collected reporting streams can be mined for systemic rather than merely local risk signals, developed for compliance monitoring in other safety-critical transport sectors (Adeyelu, 2018), applies directly to the anomaly and surveillance records that mooring programmes already generate.

A fifth theme is competence and organisational memory. The technical content of mooring integrity, catenary mechanics, corrosion science, fatigue of forged steel, subsea intervention, spans disciplines that few individuals hold simultaneously, and the reviewed failure investigations repeatedly find the connecting insight, that a stopper geometry change alters fatigue exposure, that a draught change alters the thrash zone, missed at organisational interfaces. Systematic review of hazard identification and risk control practice in complex construction projects (Obogo et al., 2019a) reports the same interface-level loss of hazard information, suggesting the mechanism is generic to multi-party technical work rather than particular to offshore moorings. Units that sustained integrity performance across decades exhibit common arrangements: a named accountable engineer for station-keeping, continuity provisions across ownership and contract changes, participation in the joint-industry fora through which failure lessons propagate, and periodic training that keeps control-room and marine staff connected to the

© DEC 2019 | IRE Journals | Volume 3 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV3I6-1722581

mooring system their actions load. These arrangements cost little and appear in no analysis model, which is perhaps why their absence is discovered only afterwards.

The limitations of this review follow from its sources. The incident record on which several conclusions rest is assembled from surveys with acknowledged under-reporting, particularly outside the North Sea regulatory regimes, so mechanism proportions carry sampling bias even where totals are indicative. The monitoring and analytics literature of the period reports predominantly successful demonstrations, and unpublished negative experience, systems abandoned, detection methods that failed quietly, is under-represented in exactly the way that inflates expectations. Vendor-reported performance figures for inspection and monitoring technologies have rarely been independently characterised, which is the gap the proposed probability-of-detection work would close. These caveats do not disturb the review's central findings, which rest on convergent evidence across independent sources, but they counsel humility in transferring any quantitative figure cited here to a specific unit without site verification.

Although framed for units in service, the review's findings read directly onto new design. The degradation record justifies design-stage decisions that cost little and repay across decades: chain interface geometry engineered against out-of-plane bending from the outset; corrosion allowances and cathodic protection sized to site-measured analogue data rather than generic rates; permanent line marking and reference-link designation delivered as part of installation; monitoring, including instrumented stoppers and metocean measurement, specified as original equipment with an operating budget; connector count minimised and Kenter links excluded; and documentation handed over in the structured, machine-usable form that the eventual life-extension assessment will require. Each of these converts a lesson purchased through the failure experience of the existing fleet into a marginal design cost, and collectively they define what a mooring system designed for integrity management, rather than merely furnished with it afterwards, looks like.

IX. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Several development directions visible at the close of this review period can be expected to mature. In sensing, the cost and reliability trajectory of subsea instrumentation, fibre-optic load measurement, longer-life battery and acoustic-link pods, autonomous underwater vehicle survey of line corridors, promises denser measurement at lower intervention cost, and resident underwater vehicles stationed on the field could convert inspection from campaign to routine. In analytics, the calibrated digital twin is the natural integrating construct: driven by measured environment and vessel response, validated against whatever direct tension measurements exist, and delivering component-level load and damage estimates that make every subsequent assessment cheaper and every anomaly interpretable. Machine-learned detection layered on position and response data will improve as labelled failure and drill datasets accumulate, and standardising such drills across the industry would accelerate it.

In assessment, the research gaps identified in Section 8 map directly onto usable products: corrosion prognosis models fed by site measurement rather than generic allowances; fatigue curves for degraded chain that make measured pitting and wear directly usable in life calculation; and probability-of-detection characterisation for subsea inspection techniques, without which risk-based inspection of moorings rests on judgement where fixed structures enjoy data. In management, the consolidation begun by API RP 2MIM invites two extensions: benchmarking of integrity key performance indicators across operators, so that surveillance effort can be tuned against outcome evidence, and industry-shared databases of failures, anomalies and recovered-component test results, extending the joint-industry-project model into a continuous institution. The FSO fleet's age structure guarantees the demand: the units now approaching extension decisions will be judged by the data their operators are, or are not, collecting today.

A final forward-looking observation concerns competence supply. The specialists who built the current knowledge base, through the failure investigations and joint industry projects of the 2000s and 2010s, are a small population concentrated in a few organisations, and the analytical migration described above will not remove the need for engineers who understand chains, soils and corrosion as physical phenomena; it will instead place them in judgement roles over increasingly automated surveillance. Industry initiatives that codify this knowledge, the recommended practices, the JIP reports, guidance notes and the textbook literature that consolidated in the late 2010s (Ma et al., 2019), are necessary but not sufficient, and structured competence development for mooring integrity engineering, with the operator community rather than any single company as its natural sponsor, would address a risk to the entire strategy this review describes: that the data arrive and no one remains who can read them.

Standardisation effort would also repay investment in three specific, unglamorous places. First, a common data schema for mooring inspection and monitoring records, link identity, measurement, uncertainty, imagery indexing, would make condition data portable across contractors, owners and decades, attacking the record-loss failure mode at its root. Second, standard test and reporting protocols for recovered-component examination would let every replacement campaign contribute comparable data to a fleet-wide evidence base rather than an isolated report. Third, agreed benchmark cases for mooring response reconstruction, measured datasets against which digital-twin implementations can be scored, would give operators an objective basis for crediting analytical monitoring in assessments, and give regulators and class societies a defensible basis for accepting it. None of these requires new science; all require the coordination that the joint-industry-project tradition in this field has repeatedly shown itself able to supply.

X. CONCLUSIONS

This review has surveyed inspection, monitoring and life-extension practice for FSO turret mooring systems as of 2019. The evidence base assembled by industry incident surveys shows in-service mooring reliability falling well short of design intent, with fatigue and corrosion the dominant causes and the top chain, connectors and touch-down zone the dominant locations. Conventional periodic visual inspection is necessary but insufficient, because it detects the dominant degradation mechanisms poorly and cannot assure prompt detection of line failure. A modern integrity strategy therefore combines risk-based inspection with quantitative dimensional trending, continuous monitoring that includes a dedicated line-failure detection function, condition monitoring of the turret bearing as a non-redundant critical element, and an analytical layer that converts measurements into component-level damage estimates. The publication of API RP 2MIM provides, for the first time, a consolidated recommended practice around which such strategies can be organised. Life extension of ageing units is achievable through targeted replacement of damage-concentrating components, site-calibrated corrosion and fatigue reassessment, and monitoring upgrades, provided the supporting data exist. Closing the identified research gaps in corrosion prognosis, degraded-chain fatigue and the validation of indirect monitoring would materially improve both the safety and the economics of continued FSO operation.

For the practitioner, the review's findings condense into a set of positions each supported by the evidence traversed above. Integrity strategy should be constructed from the failure modes outward, pairing each credible mechanism with the surveillance measure that can actually detect it, rather than from the survey calendar inward. Dimensional trending of identified reference links, sustained across campaigns and contractors, is the highest-value inspection product and the foundation of every corrosion and remaining-life argument. Prompt line-failure detection is a safety function and should be engineered, tested and drilled as one. Monitoring should be installed early enough to matter, because its principal payoffs, measured load history, calibrated models, accepted analytical relief at reassessment, accrue only with years of record. Records, link identity, configuration history, certificates and raw data, are integrity infrastructure, not administration. And the turret bearing, the one non-redundant mechanical element, warrants a surveillance and preservation programme proportionate to that status.

For the researcher, the priorities are equally concrete: corrosion prognosis calibrated to site measurement; fatigue haracterization of chain in its degraded, worn and pitted service state, including interface bending; probability-of-detection quantification for subsea inspection methods; and field validation of indirect failure-detection analytics across environments and failure locations. Each of these converts an existing practice from judgement to measurement, and each has a natural joint-industry constituency. The FSO turret mooring system will remain, for decades yet, a structure that cannot be dry-docked, largely cannot be seen, and must not fail; the work reviewed here shows that its assurance is nonetheless tractable, provided the industry continues the migration, already well underway by 2019, from assuming integrity by design to demonstrating it by data.

REFERENCES

[1] ABS (2011). Guidance Notes on the Application of Fiber Rope for Offshore Mooring. Houston, TX: American Bureau of Shipping.

[2] ABS (2018). Guide for Position Mooring Systems. Houston, TX: American Bureau of Shipping.

[3] American Petroleum Institute (2019). API RP 2MIM: Mooring Integrity Management. First Edition. Washington, DC: API.

[4] American Petroleum Institute (2019). API RP 2FSIM: Floating Systems Integrity Management. First Edition. Washington, DC: API.

[5] American Petroleum Institute (2015). API RP 2I: In-service Inspection of Mooring Hardware for Floating Structures. Third Edition. Washington, DC: API.

[6] American Petroleum Institute (2005, addenda 2008). API RP 2SK: Design and Analysis of Stationkeeping Systems for Floating Structures. Third Edition. Washington, DC: API.

[7] Arumosoye, O.M. and Obriki, O.D. (2018a). Development of an Integrated Heat Stress Risk Conceptual Model for Industrial Operations in Extreme Environments. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 1(12), 141-160.

[8] Arumosoye, O.M. and Obriki, O.D. (2019). Systematic Review of Near-miss and Hazard Observation Data Utilization in Industrial Safety Management. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(2), 981-999.

[9] Adeyelu, O.O. (2018). A Predictive Compliance Monitoring Framework for Detecting Systemic Safety Risks through Aviation Consumer Complaint Data. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(6), 341-362.

[10] Adeyelu, O.O. (2019). An Adaptive Safety Management System Implementation Model for Aerodromes in Developing Economy Contexts. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(4), 628-654.

[11] Agbabiaka, J., Okonkwo, C.S., Ogunwole, O., Mayo, W. and Okeke, O.T. (2019). Supply Chain Risk Management Model for EPC and Gas Processing Projects. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(2), 968-980.

[12] Akomolafe, O. and Agu, M.U. (2018). A Conceptual Model for Enhancing Internal Audit Quality through Technology-enabled Risk Assessment Frameworks. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 1(9), 458-475.

[13] American Petroleum Institute (2014). API RP 2SIM: Structural Integrity Management of Fixed Offshore Structures. First Edition. Washington, DC: API.

[14] American Petroleum Institute (2011). API RP 2FPS: Planning, Designing, and Constructing Floating Production Systems. Second Edition. Washington, DC: API.

[15] Atta, S., Asomani, E. and Adenuga, O.M. (2018). A Systematic Review of Green Corrosion Inhibitors from Agricultural Extracts for Mild Steel Protection in Acidic and Alkaline Media. International Journal of

Engineering and Modern Technology, 4(1), 64-97.

[16] Banfield, S. and Casey, N. (1998). Evaluation of Fibre Rope Properties for Offshore Mooring. Ocean Engineering, 25(10), 861-879.

[17] Brown, M.G., Hall, T.D., Marr, D.G., English, M. and Snell, R.O. (2005). Floating Production Mooring Integrity JIP: Key Findings. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 17499.

[18] Bureau Veritas (2014). NI 604: Fatigue of Top Chain of Mooring Lines due to In-plane and Out-of-plane Bendings. Paris: Bureau Veritas.

[19] Bureau Veritas (2015). NR 493: Classification of Mooring Systems for Permanent and Mobile Offshore Units. Paris: Bureau Veritas.

[20] Chaplin, C.R. (1995). Failure Mechanisms in Wire Ropes. Engineering Failure Analysis, 2(1), 45-57.

[21] Chakrabarti, S.K. (ed.) (2005). Handbook of Offshore Engineering. Oxford: Elsevier.

[22] DNV (2005). DNV-RP-E303: Geotechnical Design and Installation of Suction Anchors in Clay. Recommended Practice. Hovik: Det Norske Veritas.

[23] DNV (2012). DNV-RP-E301: Design and Installation of Fluke Anchors. Recommended Practice. Hovik: Det Norske Veritas.

[24] DNV GL (2015). DNVGL-OS-E301: Position Mooring. Offshore Standard. Høvik: DNV GL.

[25] DNV GL (2015). DNVGL-OS-E302: Offshore Mooring Chain. Offshore Standard. Høvik: DNV GL.

[26] DNV GL (2015). DNVGL-OS-E303: Offshore Fibre Ropes. Offshore Standard. Hovik: DNV GL.

[27] DNV GL (2015). DNVGL-OS-E304: Offshore Mooring Steel Wire Ropes. Offshore Standard. Hovik: DNV GL.

[28] Dosunmu, A.A. and Ogundele, P.O. (2019). Security Audit and Enterprise Risk Assessment Frameworks for Resilient Information Systems. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(5), 434-447.

[29] DNV GL (2016). DNVGL-RP-C203: Fatigue Design of Offshore Steel Structures. Recommended Practice. Hovik: DNV GL.

[30] Faltinsen, O.M. (1990). Sea Loads on Ships and Offshore Structures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[31] Fontaine, E., Kilner, A., Carra, C., Washington, D., Ma, K.T., Phadke, A., Laskowski, D. and Kusinski, G. (2014). Industry Survey of Past Failures, Pre-emptive Replacements and Reported Degradations for Mooring Systems of Floating Production Units. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 25273.

[32] Fontaine, E., Rosen, J., Potts, A., Ma, K.T. and Melchers, R. (2014). SCORCH JIP: Feedback on MIC and Pitting Corrosion from Field Recovered Mooring Chain Links. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 25234.

[33] Gabrielsen, O., Larsen, K. and Reinholdtsen, S.A. (2017). Fatigue Testing of Used Mooring Chain. Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering (OMAE2017), Trondheim, OMAE2017-61382.

[34] Gordon, R.B., Brown, M.G. and Allen, E.M. (2014). Mooring Integrity Management: A State-of-the-Art Review. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 25134.

[35] Health and Safety Executive (2013). Offshore Information Sheet 4/2013: Mooring Integrity Onboard Floating Production Installations. Bootle: HSE.

[36] Hørte, T., Okkenhaug, S. and Paulshus, Ø. (2017). Mooring Code Calibration for Permanent Mooring Systems. Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering (OMAE2017), Trondheim.

[37] International Organization for Standardization (2007). ISO 18692: Fibre Ropes for Offshore Stationkeeping - Polyester. Geneva: ISO.

[38] International Organization for Standardization (2013). ISO 19901-7: Petroleum and Natural Gas Industries - Specific Requirements for Offshore Structures - Part 7: Stationkeeping Systems for Floating Offshore Structures and Mobile Offshore Units. Second Edition. Geneva: ISO.

[39] International Organization for Standardization (2015). ISO 19901-1: Petroleum and Natural Gas Industries - Specific Requirements for Offshore Structures - Part 1: Metocean Design and Operating Considerations. Second Edition. Geneva: ISO.

[40] Jean, P., Goessens, K. and L'Hostis, D. (2005). Failure of Chains by Bending on Deepwater Mooring Systems. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 17238.

[41] Kvitrud, A. (2014). Anchor Line Failures - Norwegian Continental Shelf 2010-2014. Stavanger: Petroleum Safety Authority Norway.

[42] Larsen, K. and Sandvik, P.C. (1990). Efficient Methods for the Calculation of Dynamic Mooring Line Tension. Proceedings of the 1st European Offshore Mechanics Symposium, Trondheim.

[43] Lassen, T., Storvoll, E. and Bech, A. (2009). Fatigue Life Prediction of Mooring Chains Subjected to Tension and Out-of-plane Bending. Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering (OMAE2009), Honolulu, OMAE2009-79253.

[44] Ma, K.T., Shu, H., Smedley, P., L'Hostis, D. and Duggal, A. (2013). A Historical Review on Integrity Issues of Permanent Mooring Systems. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 24025.

[45] Ma, K.T., Luo, Y., Kwan, T. and Wu, Y. (2019). Mooring System Engineering for Offshore Structures. Cambridge, MA: Gulf Professional Publishing.

[46] Mbonu, I.S., Aliliele, C., Iwuanyanwu, U. and Oluoha, O.M. (2018). A Conceptual Framework for Legal and Ethical Risk Modeling in Enterprise Data Protection Governance. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(3), 269-289.

[47] Mbonu, I.S., Iwuanyanwu, U., Uzoka, E. and Oluoha, O.M. (2019). Advances in Enterprise Log Analytics and Automated Incident Response Architectures. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(4), 415-436.

[48] Melchers, R.E. (2003). Modeling of Marine Immersion Corrosion for Mild and Low-alloy Steels, Part 1: Phenomenological Model. Corrosion, 59(4), 319-334.

[49] Melchers, R.E. and Jeffrey, R. (2008). Probabilistic Models for Steel Corrosion Loss and Pitting of Marine Infrastructure. Reliability Engineering and System Safety, 93(3), 423-432.

[50] Melchers, R.E. (2005). The Effect of Corrosion on the Structural Reliability of Steel Offshore Structures. Corrosion Science, 47(10), 2391-2410.

[51] Minnebo, J., Aalberts, P. and Duggal, A. (2014). Mooring System Monitoring Using DGPS. Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering (OMAE2014), San Francisco, OMAE2014-24401.

[52] Obogo, S.F., Ozobu, C.O. and Uduokhai, D.O. (2019b). Advances in Leadership Driven Safety Culture Transformation in Large Construction Workforces. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(5), 507-523.

[53] Obogo, S.F., Uduokhai, D.O. and Ozobu, C.O. (2019a). Systematic Review of Hazard Identification and Risk Control Practices in Urban Construction Projects. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(3), 302-322.

[54] Obriki, O.D. and Arumosoye, O.M. (2018). Conceptual Modeling of Data-driven Occupational Safety Risk Control in Large-scale Energy Infrastructure Projects. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 1(7), 169-189.

[55] Obriki, O.D. and Arumosoye, O.M. (2019). A Conceptual Framework Linking Management Safety Walkthrough Frequency and Coverage to Safety Culture Outcomes in Mega Projects.

Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 2(8), 355-374.

[56] Okonkwo, C.S., Ogunwole, O., Okeke, O.T. and Mayo, W. (2019). Conceptual Framework for Cost Reduction through Contract Negotiation and Vendor Governance. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals, 3(1), 447-466.

[57] Oil & Gas UK (2008). Mooring Integrity Guidance. Aberdeen: Oil & Gas UK.

[58] Potts, A.E., Kilner, A.A., Farrow, G.H., Fontaine, E. and Melchers, R.E. (2017). SCORCH JIP: Findings from Investigations into Mooring Chain and Wire Rope Corrosion in Warm Waters. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston.

[59] Rampi, L., Dewi, F. and Vargas, P. (2015). Chain Out of Plane Bending (OPB) Joint Industry Project (JIP) Summary and Main Results. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 25779.

[60] Smedley, P. and Petruska, D. (2014). Comparison of Global Design Requirements and Failure Rates for Industry Long-Term Mooring Systems. Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, OTC 25428.

[61] Vargas, P.M., Hsu, T.M. and Lee, W.K. (2004). Stress Concentration Factors for Stud-less Mooring Chain Links in Fairleads. Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering (OMAE2004), Vancouver, OMAE2004-51376.

[62] Vryhof Anchors (2010). Anchor Manual 2010: The Guide to Anchoring. Capelle a/d IJssel: Vryhof Anchors BV.

[63] Wichers, J.E.W. (1988). A Simulation Model for a Single Point Moored Tanker. PhD Thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft.