

# Load Factor Study for API Recommended Practice 2A-LRFD

API TECHNICAL REPORT 2A-LFS  
FIRST EDITION, NOVEMBER 2020



American  
Petroleum  
Institute

## Special Notes

Standard is a broad term covering all API documents that have been developed in accordance with API's "Procedures for Standards Development". Users of this document should be aware that this publication is not a consensus document developed in accordance with these procedures and therefore does not represent an industry consensus standard. This publication is merely a report of technical research performed under contract with API. The materials represent the opinions of the researchers, and neither API nor its standards committees have made any effort to judge the content for technical accuracy or completeness. **USERS OF THIS PUBLICATION SHOULD NOT RELY SOLELY ON THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS DOCUMENT AND DO SO AT THEIR OWN RISK.**

API is not undertaking to meet the duties of employers, manufacturers, or suppliers to warn and properly train and equip their employees, and others exposed, concerning health and safety risks and precautions, nor undertaking their obligations to comply with authorities having jurisdiction. Information concerning safety and health risks and proper precautions with respect to particular materials and conditions should be obtained from the employer, the manufacturer or supplier of that material, or the material safety data sheet.

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.

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, Washington, DC 20001-5571. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein, or suggested revisions, should also be addressed to the director.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, 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.

## Foreword

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.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this document are as follows.

Shall: As used in a standard, "shall" denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard.

Should: As used in a standard, "should" denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard.

May: As used in a standard, "may" denotes a course of action permissible within the limits of a standard.

Can: As used in a standard, "can" denotes a statement of possibility or capability.

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 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](mailto:standards@api.org).

## Executive Summary

The motivation for this study is to evaluate the suitability of the load factors in API 2A-LRFD 1st Edition (1993) given the accumulated experience since the 1980s about hurricane hazards and platform performance. The specific objectives of this study are:

- 1) Review the methodology and analyses used in the 1980s to develop the load factor in the API 2A-LRFD 1st Edition and compare its methodology with the methodology presented in ISO 19902 (2007).
- 2) Analyze the component reliability levels with the improved understanding of hurricane hazard and platform performance and assess the effect of load factors on the component reliability.
- 3) Analyze the system reliability levels for three case study platforms that are being used to guide development of API 2A-LRFD 2nd Edition and assess the effect of load factors on the system reliability.
- 4) Provide design considerations when determining the load factors to be used in API 2A-LRFD 2nd Edition.

# Contents

Page

Executive Summary .....	iv
<b>1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Report Contents .....	1
<b>2 Review of API and ISO Methodologies .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	2
2.2 Design Check Formats for API .....	2
2.3 Calibration Methodology for API 2A-LRFD 1st Edition .....	2
2.4 Design Check Format for ISO 19902 .....	4
2.5 Calibration Methodology for ISO 19902 .....	4
2.5 Comparison of API LRFD and ISO Calibration Methodologies .....	5
2.6 Summary .....	6
<b>3 Wave Load Uncertainty .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	6
3.2 Wave Load Uncertainty in API 2A-LRFD 1st Edition .....	6
3.3 Updated Representation of Wave Load Uncertainty .....	8
3.4 Comparison of Previous and Updated Representation of Wave Load Uncertainty .....	13
3.5 Summary .....	15
<b>4 Evaluation of Design Component Reliability .....</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	16
4.2 Component Reliability Model .....	16
4.3 Component Reliability .....	22
4.4 Summary .....	36
<b>5 Evaluation of System Reliability .....</b>	<b>37</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	37
5.2 Deterministic Analysis .....	37
5.3 Reliability Analysis .....	48
5.4 Summary .....	65
<b>Annex A .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Annex B .....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Figures</b>	
2.1 Relationship between Probability of Failure and Reliability Index .....	3
3.1 Comparison of $\beta_{w,20}$ : (a) $\alpha = 2.0$ ; (b) $\alpha = 2.5$ .....	8
3.2 Comparison of $V_{w,20}$ : (a) $\alpha = 2.0$ ; (b) $\alpha = 2.5$ .....	8
3.3 Comparison of Probability Distribution for the Maximum Wave Load for Wave-by-Wave and Sea State Approaches during a 3-Hour Sea State .....	10
3.4 Relationship between Aleatory Peak Factor, $\psi_{sw}$ , and c.o.v. Value for Random Variations in Wave Load Bias Factor from Wave-to-Wave during a Sea State (Chen 2016) .....	11
3.5 Gulf of Mexico Regions in API 2MET (2014) .....	12
3.7 Comparison of “Exact” and Fitted Distribution for the Maximum Wave Height in 20 Years, $H_{20}$ using Updated Representation of Uncertainty in Wave Loads .....	13
3.8 Mean Value for Maximum Wave Height in 20-year Lifetime Relative to the Nominal (100-year) Design Load for Updated Representation of Wave Load Uncertainty .....	14

# Contents

Page

## Figures (continued)

3.9	c.o.v. for Maximum Wave Height in 20-year Lifetime Relative to the Nominal (100-year) Design Load for Updated Representation of Wave Load Uncertainty . . . . .	15
4.1	Test Database for Yield Strength from Offshore Structures in the Gulf of Mexico (Energ0 2010) . . . . .	19
4.2	Reliability for Different Components Averaged over Range of Typical Design Conditions: (a) All Components- $\beta_{20,avg}$ ; (b) All Components- $PF_{20,avg}$ ; (c) Tubular Joints- $\beta_{20,avg}$ ; (d) Tubular Joints- $PF_{20,avg}$ . . . . .	24
4.3	Variation of Reliability Level for Column Compression: (a) Reliability Index; (b) Failure Probability . . . . .	26
4.4	Variation of Reliability Level for All Components over Range of Typical Design Conditions: (a) Difference of Maximum and Minimum Reliability Indices and (b) Ratio of Maximum and Minimum Failure Probability . . . . .	27
4.5	Effect of Environmental Load Factor on Reliability for Bending of Tubular Members: (a) Reliability Index and (b) Failure Probability . . . . .	28
4.6	Effect of LRFD Environmental Load Factor on Average Reliability over Range of Typical Design Conditions: (a) Reliability Index and (a) Failure Probability . . . . .	29
4.7	Effect of LRFD Gravity Load Factor on Average Reliability over Range of Typical Design Conditions: (a) $\alpha = 2.0$ and (b) $\alpha = 1.0$ . . . . .	32
4.8	Sensitivity of Reliability to Water Depth: (a) Local Buckling and (b) K-Joint-Balanced Axial Loading . . . . .	33
4.9	Sensitivity of Reliability to $\alpha$ : (a) Local Buckling and (b) Piles in Compression . . . . .	33
4.10	Sensitivity of Reliability to Steel Grade and Nominal Bias in Steel Yield Strength for All Components . . . . .	34
4.11	Sensitivity of $\beta_{20}$ to $D/t$ for a Tubular Member in Pure Bending. . . . .	35
4.12	Sensitivity of $\beta_{20}$ to $\lambda$ for a Column in Compression . . . . .	35
4.13	Sensitivity of Reliability to LRFD Resistance Factors . . . . .	36
5.1	Platform 4: (a) Three-dimensional SACS Model; (b) Foundation Plan View . . . . .	38
5.2	Comparison of Simplified Wave Model with SACS Results Platform 4 . . . . .	39
5.3	Sensitivity of Pushover Results with Wave Load Pattern Platform 4 . . . . .	40
5.4	Pile System Failure Surface Platform 4 . . . . .	41
5.5	Platform Ultimate Resistance Versus Wave Load Direction Platform 4 . . . . .	41
5.6	Platform 5: (a) Three-dimensional SACS Model; (b) Foundation Plan View . . . . .	42
5.7	Comparison of Simplified Wave Model with SACS Results-Platform 5 . . . . .	43
5.8	Sensitivity of Pushover Results with Wave Load Pattern-Platform 5 . . . . .	44
5.9	Pile System Failure Surface-Platform 5 . . . . .	44
5.10	Platform ultimate resistance-Platform 5 . . . . .	45
5.11	Platform 6: (a) Three-dimensional SACS model; (b) Foundation Plan View . . . . .	45
5.12	Comparison of Simplified Wave Model with SACS Results-Platform 6 . . . . .	46
5.13	Sensitivity of Pushover Results with Wave Load pattern-Platform 6 . . . . .	47
5.14	Pile System Failure Surface-Platform 6 . . . . .	47
5.15	Platform Ultimate Resistance-Platform 6 . . . . .	48
5.16 (a)	Component Reliabilities for Platform 4 . . . . .	51
5.16 (b)	Component Reliabilities for Platform 5 . . . . .	51
5.16 (c)	Component Reliabilities for Platform 6 . . . . .	52
5.17 (a)	System Reliabilities for Platform 4 . . . . .	53
5.17 (b)	System Reliabilities for Platform 5 . . . . .	54
5.17 (c)	System Reliabilities for Platform 6 . . . . .	54

# Contents

Page

## Figures (continued)

5.18	Probability that Pile System Fails Given a Platform Failure for Case Study Platforms . . . . .	57
5.19 (a)	Annual Failure Probability for Platform System (Jacket and/or Piles) Versus Environmental Load Factor for Platform 4 . . . . .	57
5.19 (b)	Annual Failure Probability for Platform System (Jacket and/or Piles) Versus Environmental Load Factor for Platform 5 . . . . .	58
5.19 (c)	Annual Failure Probability for Platform System (Jacket and/or Piles) Versus Environmental Load Factor for Platform 6 . . . . .	58
5.20 (a)	Annual Failure Probability for Jacket System Versus Environmental Load Factor for Platform 4 . . . . .	59
5.20 (b)	Annual Failure Probability for Jacket System Versus Environmental Load Factor for Platform 5 . . . . .	59
5.20 (c)	Annual Failure Probability for Jacket System Versus Environmental Load Factor for Platform 6 . . . . .	60
5.21 (a)	System Complexity Factor for Jacket Members Versus Loading Direction . . . . .	61
5.21 (b)	System Complexity Factor for Tubular Joints Versus Loading Direction . . . . .	61
5.21 (c)	System Complexity Factor for Pile Bending Versus Loading Direction . . . . .	62
5.21 (d)	System Complexity Factor for Pile Plunging/Pulling Versus Loading Direction . . . . .	62
5.22 (a)	System Redundancy Factor for Jacket System Versus Loading Direction . . . . .	64
5.22 (b)	System Redundancy Factor for Pile System Versus Loading Direction . . . . .	64
A.1	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ -yielding . . . . .	70
A.2	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with Water Depth-yielding . . . . .	71
A.3	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\alpha$ -yielding . . . . .	71
A.4	Test Data, Nominal, and Mean Resistance Curves . . . . .	74
A.5	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ -Local Buckling . . . . .	75
A.6	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with Water Depth-Local Buckling . . . . .	75
A.7	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\alpha$ -Local Buckling . . . . .	76
A.8	Test Data and Nominal Resistance Curve . . . . .	78
A.9	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ Bending $D/t = 40$ . . . . .	79
A.10	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with Water Depth Bending $D/t = 40$ . . . . .	79
A.11	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\alpha$ Bending $D/t = 40$ . . . . .	80
A.12	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ Compression: (a) $\lambda = 0.8$ ; (b) $\lambda = 1.5$ . . . . .	84
A.13	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with Water Depth Compression . . . . .	85
A.14	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\alpha$ -Compression . . . . .	85
A.15	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\lambda$ -Compression . . . . .	86
A.16	Regression for Hydrostatic Hoop Buckling . . . . .	89
A.17	Variation of $\beta$ with X-WSD and LRFD-Hydrostatic Loading . . . . .	90
A.18	Variation of $\beta$ with X-Steel Type Hydrostatic Loading . . . . .	90
A.19	Variation of $\beta$ with $W_n/G_n$ -Pile Compression: (a) Clay; (b) Sand . . . . .	92
A.20	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with Water Depth-Pile Compression . . . . .	93
A.21	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\alpha$ -Pile Compression . . . . .	93
A.22	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ -Pile Tension: (a) Clay; (b) Sand . . . . .	94
A.23	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ and Gravity Load Factor-Pile Compression . . . . .	95
A.24	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ and Environmental Load Factor-Pile Compression . . . . .	95
A.25	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ and Gravity Load Factor-Pile Tension . . . . .	96
A.26	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $W_n/G_n$ : (a) K-joint Balanced Axial loading; and (b) Y-joint Tension Loading . . . . .	100
A.27	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with Water Depth-K-joint Balanced Axial Loading . . . . .	101

## Contents

Page

### Figures (continued)

A.28	Variation of $\beta_{20}$ with $\alpha$ -K-joint Balanced Axial Loading	101
A.29	Comparison of Joint $\beta_{20, avg}$ -WSD versus LRFD	102
A.30	Comparison of Range of $\beta_{20, avg}$ for $W_n/G_n$ from 2 to 40	102
A.31	Comparison of Joint $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Different Yield Strength Biases	103
A.32	Comparison of Joint $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Different Environmental Load Factors	103
A.33	Comparison of Joint $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Different Gravity Load and Resistance Factors	104
B.1	Load-displacement Responses Based on Monte Carlo Simulation to Model Variability in Steel Yield Strength Between Member Groups of Steel Components: (a) Platform 4; (b) Platform 5; and (c) Platform 6	108
B.2	Histogram of Normalized Jacket System Resistance Based on Monte Carlo Simulation to Model Variability in Steel Yield Strength between Member Groups of Steel Components: (a) Three Individual Jackets and (b) Three Jackets Combined	109

### Tables

3.1	Summary on $\bar{\beta}_{w, 20}$ and $V_{w, 20}$ , Averaged over Water Depths from 100 ft to 450 ft, for Updated and Previous Representations of Wave Load Uncertainty	15
4.1	Random Variables Describing Component Load (Moses, 1986)	17
4.2	Random Variables Describing Component Loads-Updated Analysis	17
4.3	Mean and c.o.v. for Steel Yield Strength (Enerco, 2010)	19
4.4	Mean and c.o.v. for Bias in Nominal Yield Strength for Steel	19
4.5	Mean and c.o.v. for Tension Resistance Bias	20
4.6	Mean and c.o.v. for Local Buckling Resistance Bias	20
4.7	Mean and c.o.v. for Pure Bending Resistance Bias	20
4.8	Mean and c.o.v. for Column Compression Strength Bias	20
4.9	Mean and c.o.v. for Hydrostatic Core Length Bias	21
4.10	Mean and c.o.v. for Pile Axial Capacity Bias	21
4.11	Mean and c.o.v. for Joint Strength Biases	22
4.12	Effect of Environmental Load Factor on Average Reliability Index over Range of Typical Design Conditions for Components with 2014 Metocean Characteristics	30
4.13	Effect of Environmental Load Factor on Average Failure Probability over Range of Typical Design Conditions for Components with 2014 Metocean Characteristics	31
5.1	Summary of $c_1$ and $\alpha$ for Global Base Shear Platform 4	39
5.2	Summary of $c_1$ and $\alpha$ for global base shear-Platform 5	43
5.3	Summary of $c_1$ and $\alpha$ for Global Base Shear-Platform 6	46
5.4	Nominal Gravity Load Bias, $(B_G)_k$ , Used in Assessing Component Reliability	48
5.5	Variables Used in Estimating Ultimate Base Shear Resistance of Jacket Structure	49
5.6	Variables Used in Estimating Ultimate Base Shear Resistance of Pile System	50
5.7	Variables Used in Estimating Ultimate Base Shear Resistance of Pile System	56
A.1	Summary of Mean and c.o.v. for Tension Resistance Bias	72
A.2	Sensitivity of $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Yielding using API 2MET (2014)	72
A.3	Summary of Mean and c.o.v. for Local Buckling Resistance Bias	73
A.4	Sensitivity of $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Local Buckling using API 2MET (2014)	74
A.5	Summary of Mean And c.o.v. for Pure Bending Resistance Bias	77
A.6	Sensitivity of $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Compression using API 2MET (2014)	78
A.7	Influence of Variables on Mean and c.o.v. of Column Compression Strength Bias	82
A.8	Sensitivity of $\beta_{20, avg}$ for Compression Using API 2MET (2014) with $D/t = 40$ and $\lambda = 0.8$	83

## Contents

	Page
Tables (continued)	
A.9	Example Calculations of Mean Bias of Hydrostatic Strength for A36 Steel in Updated Analysis ..... 88
A.10	Example Calculations of c.o.v. of Bias in Hydrostatic Strength for A36 Steel in Updated Analysis ..... 88
A.11	Summary of Mean and c.o.v. for Hydrostatic Strength Bias ..... 89
A.12	Summary of Mean and c.o.v. for Pile Axial Capacity Bias ..... 91
A.13	Summary of Mean and c.o.v. for Joint Strength Biases ..... 97
A.14	Summary of Mean and c.o.v. for Joint Strength Bias Test Database (Pecknold et al. 2007) ..... 98
A.15	Factor of Safety and Resistance Factors in Different Criteria ..... 99
B.1	Mean and c.o.v. Values for Systematic Bias Factors for System Performance ..... 111
B.2	Correlation Coefficients between Systematic Bias Factor for System Performance ..... 111

# Load Factor Study for API Recommended Practice 2A-LRFD

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

The American Petroleum Institute (API) published the 1<sup>st</sup> Edition of the Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) guideline, i.e. API 2A-LRFD (1993), in 1993 after about 10 years development and calibration work through the 1980s. The LRFD-format was intended to improve the conventional Working Stress Design (WSD) format in the following ways (Lloyd and Karsan 1988, Moses 1981, Moses and Russell 1980, Moses 1986, and Moses and Stahl 2000): (1) produce more uniform reliability levels by using load and resistance factors that account for the relative variability in the load and resistance; (2) provide greater flexibility to incorporate new technological findings and extend existing experience to new geographic areas and new platform types; and (3) keep pace with modern code development in other engineering applications.

Although API 2A-LRFD (1993) was widely recognized and had a significant influence on the development of the International Standard ISO 19902, it was not used commonly in the United States and was withdrawn in 2012 due to a lack of maintenance. API 2A-LRFD was re-introduced in 2014 as a draft 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition in an effort to align and merge the API and ISO standards as a single global standard (Ku and Farrel 2014). The motivation for this study is to evaluate the suitability of the load factors in API 2A-LRFD (1993) given the accumulated experience since the 1980s about hurricane hazards and platform performance.

### 1.2 Report Contents

This report contains six chapters and two annexes.

Chapter 1 summarizes the development of the LRFD-format for design fixed offshore platforms and describes the motivation and objectives of this study.

Chapter 2 presents basic design check equations for the WSD- and LRFD-formats and compares the calibration methodologies in API 2A-LRFD 1<sup>st</sup> Edition and ISO 19902.

Chapter 3 reviews the characterization of wave load uncertainty in the development of API 2A-LRFD 1<sup>st</sup> Edition and updates this characterization based on our current understanding of hurricane hazards.

Chapter 4 assesses the reliabilities achieved in the design of components using both the WSD- and LRFD-formats and investigates the effect of the environmental and gravity load factors on the reliability levels achieved for different components.

Chapter 5 assesses the component and system reliabilities for three case study platforms (3-leg, 4-leg, and 8-leg) and investigates the effect the environmental load factor on the system reliability.

Chapter 6 presents conclusions because of this work.

Annex A presents the detailed analyses of the reliability levels of each component.

Annex B presents the assumptions, models, and input parameters for the reliability analyses of the case study platforms.