

In-service Inspection of Mooring Hardware for Floating Structures

API RECOMMENDED PRACTICE 2I
THIRD EDITION, APRIL 2008

REAFFIRMED, SEPTEMBER 2020



American
Petroleum
Institute

In-service Inspection of Mooring Hardware for Floating Structures

Upstream Segment

API RECOMMENDED PRACTICE 21
THIRD EDITION, APRIL 2008

REAFFIRMED, SEPTEMBER 2020



American
Petroleum
Institute

Special Notes

API publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein, or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by the Institute to assure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the Institute makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven, sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

Any manufacturer marking equipment or materials in conformance with the marking requirements of an API standard is solely responsible for complying with all the applicable requirements of that standard. API does not represent, warrant, or guarantee that such products do in fact conform to the applicable API standard.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Publishing Services, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

Copyright © 2008 American Petroleum Institute

Foreword

This recommended practice is under the jurisdiction of the API Subcommittee on Offshore Structures.

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

This document was produced under API standardization procedures that ensure appropriate notification and participation in the developmental process and is designated as an API standard. Questions concerning the interpretation of the content of this publication or comments and questions concerning the procedures under which this publication was developed should be directed in writing to the Director of Standards, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein should also be addressed to the director.

Generally, API standards are reviewed and revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn at least every five years. A one-time extension of up to two years may be added to this review cycle. Status of the publication can be ascertained from the API Standards Department, telephone (202) 682-8000. A catalog of API publications and materials is published annually and updated quarterly by API, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001, standards@api.org

Contents

	Page
1 Scope	1
1.1 General	1
1.2 Purpose	1
1.3 Inspection Philosophy and Exception to This Document	1
1.4 Mooring Component Traceability and Inspection Documentation	2
2 Guidelines for In-service Inspection of MODU Mooring Chain and Anchor Jewelry	2
2.1 Common Problems with MODU Chain	2
2.2 Recommended Inspection Method	3
2.3 Recommended Inspection Procedure	7
2.4 Guidelines for Rejecting Chain Components	12
2.5 Guidelines for Chain Repair, Removal, and Replacement	14
2.6 Recommended Inspection Schedule	15
2.7 Special Event Inspection	16
3 Guidelines for In-service Inspection of MODU Mooring-wire Rope and Anchor Handling Equipment ..	16
3.1 Common Problems with MODU Mooring-wire Rope	16
3.2 Recommended Inspection Method	23
3.3 Recommended Inspection Procedure	26
3.4 Guidelines for Rejecting Wire Rope	30
3.5 Recommended Inspection Schedule	32
3.6 Special Event Inspection	33
3.7 Recommendations for Proper Use and Maintenance of MODU Mooring-wire Rope	33
3.8 Inspection of Anchor-handling Equipment and Termination of Pendant Wire Rope	33
4 Inspection of Steel Components for Permanent Moorings	35
4.1 General	35
4.2 Difference Between MODU and Permanent Mooring Inspection	35
4.3 Typical Components in Permanent Moorings	35
4.4 Mooring Component Information	36
4.5 Inspection Objective, Type, and Schedule	37
4.6 Detailed Component Inspection and Discard Criteria	39
5 Inspection of Fiber Rope for MODU and Permanent Moorings	48
5.1 General	48
5.2 Inspection and Testing Techniques	49
5.3 Damage Assessment and Discard Criteria	50
5.4 Repair Procedures	57
5.5 Inspection and Maintenance Procedures	58
Annex A (normative) Mooring Component Traceability, Inspection, and Retirement Documentation	61
Annex B (informative) MODU Mooring Inspection for Areas of Tropical Cyclone	67
Annex C (informative) Summary of JIP Test Data and Fiber Area Reduction Criteria	71
Bibliography	73
Figures	
1 Typical Chain Stud Problems	4
2 Chain Diameter Measurement	5
3 Dockside Inspection Method	6

4	Offshore Inspection Method	7
5	Chain Length Measurement	9
6	Inspection of Anchor Jewelry	11
7	Discard Criterion for Bent Links	12
8	Examples of Severely Loose Studs	15
9	Examples of Distributed Crown Wire Breaks	17
10	Typical Wire Fractures	17
11	Locally Grouped Broken Wires	18
12	Local Decrease in Rope Diameter	18
13	Progression of Wear in Wire Rope	20
14	Wire Rope with Heavy External Corrosion	21
15	Progression of External Corrosion	22
16	Wear of Internal Wires Caused by Lack of Lubrication Between Wires	23
17	Effect of Internal Lubrication on Wire Rope	24
18	Kink and Bend of Wire Rope	24
19	Deformation Caused by Improper Drum Winding	25
20	Wire Rope Inspection with Assistance of a Workboat	25
21	Lay Length and Diameter Measurement	27
22	Internal Inspection of Wire Rope	29
23	Common Rope Constructions for Mooring Applications	31
24	Acceptable Terminations for Pendant Wire Rope	34
25	Examples of Subsea Connectors	36
26	Chain Details Recorded by Work Class and Micro-RC	40
27	Example of Chain Wear from Sitting in a Fairlead Pocket	40
28	Example of Chain Wear at Hawse Pipe	42
29	Example of Heavy Marine Growth and Chain Corrosion at Splash Zone	42
30	Example of Detached Clump Weight on the Seabed	43
31	Chain Diameter Reduction Due to Excessive Interlink Wear	43
32	Example of Chain Link Subjected to Out-of-Plane Bending	44
33	Example of Bird Caging and Kinking of Spiral Strand During Installation	46
34	Example of Disconnected Anodes for Individual Strand	47
35	Wire Rope Socket Disconnected Due to Detachment of Retaining Pin	48
36	Fiber Rope Test Insert for Rope Inspection	49
37	Example of Concentrated Damage	51
38	Example of Distributed Damage	53
39	Example of Damage to Splice	54
40	Example of Minor Jacket Damage	54
41	Examples of Severe Jacket Damage	55
42	Marine Growth Detected Between the Jacket and Load Carrying Fiber	56
43	Example of Potentially Harmful Marine Growths	56
44	Marine Growths at 200 ft Below Water Surface in DeepStar TLM	57
45	Rope Twisting During Installation	57
A.1	Measurements for Chain Manufacturing Record	62
C.1	JH Full Rope Test Results	72
Table of Contents		
1	Upper Limit of Length Over Five Links and Length of Individual Link for Used Chain	14
2	Chain Inspection Intervals	16
3	Criteria for Crown Broken Wires	31
4	Wire Rope Inspection Intervals	32

Introduction

The third edition of API RP 21 is an extension of the second edition, which addresses in-service inspection of mooring components for MODUs only. Major changes of this edition include:

- inspection guidelines for steel permanent moorings on permanent floating installations are added;
- inspection guidelines for fiber ropes used for permanent and MODU moorings are included;
- special guidance for MODU mooring inspection in the areas of tropical cyclones is provided.

The third edition was developed in response to the need for inspection guidelines of permanent and fiber rope moorings in addition to MODU moorings. The additional guidelines are based on study results of joint industry projects (JIPs) and industry experience accumulated in the last 15 years operating a large number of MODUs and permanent floating installations. This document compiles factors that are best understood and can be quantified at this time. The information in this document will be updated after further experience and knowledge are gained. Accordingly, comments and suggestions toward broadening and refining these guidelines are encouraged.

In-service Inspection of Mooring Hardware for Floating Structures

1 Scope

1.1 General

This recommended practice provides guidelines for inspecting mooring components of mobile offshore drilling units (MODUs) and permanent floating installations. Although this document was primarily developed for the moorings of MODUs and permanent floating installations, some of the guidelines may be applicable to moorings of other floating vessels such as pipe-laying barges and construction vessels. Furthermore, some of the guidelines may be applicable to secondary or emergency moorings such as moorings for jack-up units, shuttle tanker moorings, and dynamic positioning (DP) vessel harbor mooring.

The applicability of this document to the moorings of other floating vessels is left to the discretion of the user.

1.2 Purpose

The need for rigorous, effective inspection of mooring hardware is apparent because most of the mooring failures involved faulty mooring components including corroded or physically damaged wire-rope or chain, defective connecting links, or mooring hardware of inferior quality. This document should be useful to engineers and operating personnel concerned with the following:

- a) planning a mooring inspection;
- b) conducting or supervising a mooring inspection;
- c) deciding whether to reject, repair, or replace mooring hardware;
- d) communicating with others concerning acceptable mooring hardware.

1.3 Inspection Philosophy and Exception to This Document

1.3.1 Inspection Philosophy

The inspection philosophy of this document is to remove a mooring component with excessive deterioration from service. Based on this philosophy, a criterion of limiting the strength reduction to 10 % minimum breaking strength (MBS) was established in the first edition of this document. This criterion has been used by the industry for more than 20 years with generally satisfactory results, and it has become a long standing and widely accepted criterion.

1.3.2 Inspection and Design Check

It should be emphasized that this document does not address the critical design issues such as tension factor of safety and fatigue, although some discussion is given to the design issue of corrosion allowance. Any attempt to link inspection with these critical design issues will make discard criteria a moving target, depending on design assumptions, analysis software used, margin of safety, and location of the operation, etc. Setting an industry inspection standard in this case is impossible. The design check should be conducted separately. If the design check indicates that the reliability of the mooring system can be overly compromised, the acceptance of a mooring component that passes the discard criteria should be carefully re-evaluated. On the other hand, if the design check indicates that the mooring component is significantly over-designed, and it can tolerate much more damage than allowed by this document, design calculations should be submitted to the appropriate authority asking for permission