

DERIVATION OF EXTREME NON-GAUSSIAN STOCHASTIC OFFSHORE  
STRUCTURAL RESPONSES USING FINITE MEMORY NONLINEAR SYSTEM

NURUL 'AZIZAH BINTI MUKHLAS

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

DERIVATION OF EXTREME NON-GAUSSIAN STOCHASTIC OFFSHORE  
STRUCTURAL RESPONSES USING FINITE MEMORY NONLINEAR SYSTEM

NURUL 'AZIZAH BINTI MUKHLAS

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Razak Faculty of Technology and Informatics  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

SEPTEMBER 2020

## **DEDICATION**

My sincere thanks to Allah and to my family, especially my husband, Zulhilmi Abdullah, my daughter, Zulaikha Zulhilmi and my parents for their continuous support and encouragement. Special thanks also to my colleagues as well as all my friends whose help and support has allowed me to complete this research successfully. Thank You

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, praise is to God Almighty, Allah S.W.T., for his blessings, mercy and guidance. Peace and blessings also be upon noble, Muhammad S.A.W. Alhamdulillah, with His permission, I have been to complete this thesis for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy within the given period of time. In the process of preparing this thesis, I had been in contact with my supervisors, partner of research, and other friends. They have positively contributed towards my understanding throughout this study. Therefore, I would like to express my special appreciation to my supervisor, Dr Noor Irza binti Mohd Zaki, and my co-supervisor, Dr Mohd Khairi bin Abu Husain, for all their guidance, comments and assistance which have helped me in completing this thesis. I have learnt a lot from them and am very lucky to have them as my supervisors.

Other than that, I would like to extend my special thanks and appreciation to my research team, especially Mr Sayyid Zainal Abidin bin Sayyid Ahmad, who have made this a good team effort. Without their presence, I would not have been able to complete this study, especially the simulation work. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the man behind my success, my husband Mr Zulhilmi Abdullah, my strength, my daughter Zulaikha Zulhilmi, and other family members and fellow friends for their support and encouragement. I am also indebted to Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) for funding my Ph.D study. May God Almighty reward the kindness extended to me by all parties.

## ABSTRACT

For offshore structural design, the load due to wind-generated random waves is usually the most important source of loading. A nonlinear wave analysis is recommended to represent a realistic ocean wave for an accurate prediction of extreme offshore structural response. Nevertheless, the contribution of nonlinearity especially due to the wave-wave interaction leads to a complex solution. In fact, the random wave load itself experienced a nonlinearity due to the drag component of Morison's load, the effect of load intermittency around the member in the splash zone, and the presence of current; which result in a non-Gaussian offshore structural response. The most accurate and versatile method for predicting the statistical properties of extreme responses on a subjected load is the Monte Carlo time simulation method, which can account for all sorts of nonlinearities without introducing any approximations. However, it is computationally very demanding due to its complex procedure in simulating the structural response as reliable results require a very large number of simulations. Therefore, a simple method using finite-memory nonlinear system (FMNS) has been introduced by previous researchers and is proven to improve the efficiency of evaluating offshore structural responses without sacrificing its accuracy. The method is, however, only applicable based on the linear wave analysis. Hence, by taking advantage of the efficiency of FMNS method, a new model needs to be developed by integrating the FMNS method with a nonlinear wave analysis for a more reliable result. It is the derivation of non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structural response using finite-memory nonlinear system, known as FMNS<sub>NL</sub> (subscript *NL* indicates nonlinear). In the model development process, the surface elevation is generated first according to a nonlinear wave analysis with at least second-order wave. Then, two components of system are introduced, in which the first component enabled the transformation from a reference surface elevation to a second-order linearized quasi-static responses, while the second component involved the development of nonlinear function based on the relationship of second-order nonlinear and linearized quasi-static responses. Four models have been developed, in which the best model can produce an output of approximate values of second-order nonlinear quasi-static response that is very close to its corresponding values obtained using Monte Carlo time simulation method and will then be used for further examination. Based on the correlation coefficient between those two methods, the best relationship with value of 0.9783 was obtained by model 4 on the drag-induced quasi-static base shear for high significant wave height. The procedure of model development based on those two components is examined for all sea state conditions with  $H_s = 5, 10$  and  $15$  m, and with the presence of current,  $\bar{U} = 0$  m/sec and  $\pm 0.90$  m/sec. As a result, the relationship of model 4 fits the data better for all cases. It should be noted that this investigation of in-service analysis is carried out only for quasi-static structure by neglecting the dynamic effect. Based on the result of the short-term analysis, FMNS<sub>NL</sub> method provided a good accuracy of prediction of 100-year responses compared with the corresponding prediction using Monte Carlo time simulation method for all cases. A comparison has been made according to the ratio of prediction between FMNS<sub>NL</sub> and Monte Carlo time simulation methods. Overall, the accuracy level achieved by FMNS<sub>NL</sub> method is in the range of 82% to 99.8%, in which the accuracy level improved with the presence of positive current and vice versa with negative current. The same conclusion is valid for long-term analysis since the accuracy performance of FMNS<sub>NL</sub> followed exactly as previous analysis for short-term distribution. Without the presence of current along the wave propagation, the accuracy level of FMNS<sub>NL</sub> method is in the range of 80% to 96%. If there exist a current with the same direction of the wave (positive current), the accuracy improved with an increment of 1% to 7%. However, the opposite direction of current (negative current) provided a severe impact on its prediction with a reduction of 1% to 18% of accuracy. Hence, the method of FMNS<sub>NL</sub> can then be used with an excellent efficiency and accuracy to determine the extreme offshore structural response. With that, the offshore structure is towards optimization that leads to cost reduction and preservation of safety.

## ABSTRAK

Bagi reka bentuk struktur luar pesisir, beban akibat gelombang rawak yang dijana oleh angin biasanya merupakan beban yang paling utama. Analisis gelombang ketaklelurusan disyorkan untuk mewakili gelombang lautan yang sebenar untuk ramalan tepat mengenai tindak balas struktur luar pesisir yang paling tinggi. Namun begitu, analisis gelombang yang bersifat ketaklelurusan disebabkan oleh interaksi antara gelombang membawa kepada penyelesaian yang kompleks. Sebenarnya, beban gelombang rawak itu sendiri mengalami ketaklelurusan kerana komponen seretan di persamaan Morison, kesan beban terputus di zon permukaan air, dan kehadiran arus; yang menghasilkan tindak balas bersefak bukan Gaussian. Teknik yang paling tepat dan serba boleh untuk meramalkan tindak balas statistik yang paling tinggi pada beban yang dikenakan adalah teknik simulasi masa Monte Carlo yang dapat menjelaskan segala macam beban yang bersifat tak lurus tanpa memperkenalkan perkiraan. Walau bagaimanapun pengiraannya sangat rumit kerana prosedurnya yang kompleks dalam mensimulasikan tindak balas struktur disebabkan jumlah simulasi yang sangat besar diperlukan bagi mendapatkan keputusan yang tepat. Oleh itu, kaedah yang mudah dengan menggunakan sistem tak lurus ingatan terhingga (FMNS) telah diperkenalkan oleh penyelidik terdahulu, dan terbukti dapat meningkatkan kecekapan menilai tindak balas struktur luar pesisir serta menjamin ketepatannya. Akan tetapi kaedah tersebut hanya diaplikasikan berdasarkan analisis gelombang lurus. Oleh itu, dengan memanfaatkan kecekapan kaedah FMNS, model baru perlu dibentuk dengan mengintegrasikan kaedah FMNS dengan analisis gelombang bersifat ketaklelurusan untuk hasil yang lebih sahih. Ini adalah hasil tindak balas struktur luar pesisir bukan Gaussian menggunakan sistem tak lurus ingatan terhingga yang dikenali sebagai FMNS<sub>NL</sub> (simbol *NL* merujuk kepada ketaklelurusan). Dalam proses membentuk model, ketinggian permukaan air dijana terlebih dahulu mengikut analisis gelombang ketaklelurusan dengan sekurang-kurangnya gelombang tertib kedua. Kemudian, dua komponen sistem diperkenalkan di mana komponen pertama membolehkan transformasi dari ketinggian permukaan air ke tindak balas statik tertib kedua yang lurus, manakala komponen kedua melibatkan pembentukan fungsi tak lurus berdasarkan hubung kait tindak balas statik tertib kedua yang tak lurus dengan yang lurus. Empat model telah dibentuk, di mana model terbaik dapat menghasilkan hasil dari tindak balas statik tertib kedua tak lurus yang paling hampir dengan nilai yang diperolehi menggunakan kaedah simulasi Monte Carlo dan seterusnya akan digunakan untuk uji kaji selanjutnya. Berdasarkan pekali korelasi antara kedua-dua kaedah tersebut, nilai 0.9783 diperolehi oleh model 4 pada tindak balas statik daya ricih yang disebabkan oleh seretan untuk gelombang signifikan yang tinggi. Prosedur pembentukan model FMNS<sub>NL</sub> berdasarkan kedua-dua komponen tersebut telah dijalankan untuk semua keadaan laut dengan  $H_s = 5, 10$  dan  $15$  m, dan dengan kehadiran arus,  $\bar{U} = 0$  m/saat dan  $\pm 0.90$  m/saat. Hasilnya, korelasi model 4 lebih sesuai dengan data untuk semua keadaan. Perlu diingat bahawa penyelidikan analisis dalam perkhidmatan ini hanya dilakukan untuk struktur statik dengan mengabaikan kesan dinamik. Berdasarkan hasil analisis jangka pendek, kaedah FMNS<sub>NL</sub> memberikan ketepatan ramalan yang baik untuk tindak balas 100 tahun berbanding dengan ramalan yang sama menggunakan kaedah simulasi Monte Carlo untuk semua keadaan. Perbandingan telah dibuat mengikut nisbah ramalan antara kaedah simulasi FMNS<sub>NL</sub> dengan Monte Carlo. Secara keseluruhannya, tahap ketepatan yang dicapai dengan kaedah FMNS<sub>NL</sub> berada dalam lingkungan 82% hingga 99.8%, di mana tahap ketepatan bertambah baik dengan kehadiran arus positif dan sebaliknya dengan arus negatif. Kesimpulan yang sama dapat dibuat untuk analisis jangka panjang kerana tahap ketepatan kaedah FMNS<sub>NL</sub> adalah sama seperti analisis sebelumnya untuk pengagihan jangka pendek. Tanpa kehadiran arus sepanjang penyebaran gelombang, tahap ketepatan kaedah FMNS<sub>NL</sub> berada dalam lingkungan 80% hingga 96%. Sekiranya wujud arus dengan arah gelombang yang sama (arus positif), ketepatannya bertambah dengan kenaikan 1% hingga 7%. Walau bagaimanapun, arah arus yang berlawanan (arus negatif) memberi impak yang teruk terhadap ramalannya dengan pengurangan ketepatan 1% hingga 18%. Oleh itu, kaedah FMNS<sub>NL</sub> boleh digunakan dengan kecekapan dan ketepatan yang sangat baik untuk menentukan tindak balas struktur luar pesisir yang ekstrem. Dengan itu, struktur luar pesisir menuju ke arah pengoptimuman yang membawa kepada pengurangan kos dan pemeliharaan keselamatan.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
	<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>iii</b>
	<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>iv</b>
	<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>v</b>
	<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vii</b>
	<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>vi</b>
	<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xii</b>
	<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xiv</b>
	<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xx</b>
	<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Aim and Objectives of the Research	6
1.4	Scope of the Research	6
1.5	Significance of the Research	8
1.6	Thesis Outline	9
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Introduction	11
2.1.1	Quantitative Risk Analysis	12
2.1.2	Structural Reliability Analysis	13
2.2	Random Variable of Loads	15
2.2.1	Stochasticity of Ocean Waves	15
2.2.1.1	Pierson-Moskowitz Wave Spectrum	16
2.2.1.2	JONSWAP Wave Spectrum	18
2.2.2	Wave Model	19

2.2.2.1	Airy Theory (Linear)	22
2.2.2.2	Stokes Wave Theory	23
2.2.2.3	Cnoidal Wave Theory	24
2.2.2.4	Solitary Wave Theory	24
2.2.3	Importance of Nonlinearities in the Wave Analysis	25
2.2.3.1	Water Particle Motion	28
2.2.3.2	Wave Interaction	29
2.2.4	Second-order Nonlinear Wave Theory	31
2.2.5	Wave generation	34
2.2.5.1	Formulation Wave Profile using Fast Fourier Transform	35
2.2.6	Water Particle Kinematics	36
2.2.6.1	Water Particle Kinematics above Mean Water Level	38
2.2.7	Wave Forces on Submerged Cylinder	41
2.2.7.1	Keulegan-Carpenter and Reynold's number	42
2.2.7.2	Roughness factor	44
2.3	Offshore Structural Responses	45
2.3.1	100-year Extreme Responses Approaches	46
2.3.1.1	All Sea State Approach	47
2.3.1.2	Environmental Contour Line Approach	48
2.3.1.3	Peak Over Threshold Approach	49
2.4	Structural Reliability Measures	49
2.5	Probabilistic Modeling	51
2.5.1	Probability Domain	53
2.5.2	Frequency Domain	54
2.5.3	Time Domain	56
2.6	Research Gap	61



<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>65</b>
3.1	Introduction	65
3.2	Research Flowchart	66
3.3	Step A: Evaluation of Second-order Offshore Structural Response using Monte Carlo Time Simulation Method	68
3.3.1	Short-term Probability Distribution of Extreme Offshore Structural Responses	73
3.4	Step B: Model Development of FMNS Method based on Second-order wave Analysis (FMNS <sub>NL</sub> )	77
3.4.1	Structure of FMNS <sub>NL</sub>	78
3.4.1.1	Linear System	78
3.4.1.2	Zero-memory Nonlinear System	80
3.4.2	FMNS <sub>NL</sub> Modelling of Extreme Offshore Structural Responses	90
3.4.2.1	Numerical Example of FMNS <sub>NL</sub>	92
3.5	Step C: Long-term Probability Distribution of Extreme Offshore Structural Response	94
3.5.1	Wave Scatter Diagram	95
3.5.1.1	Extending the Wave Scatter Diagram	97
3.5.2	Derivation of Long-term Probability Distribution of Extreme Offshore Structural Response	102
3.6	Test Structure	104
3.7	Summary	107
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>109</b>
4.1	Introduction	109
4.2	Analysis on Accuracy of Prediction 100-year Extreme Offshore Structural Response	109
4.2.1	Short-Term Probability Distribution of the Non-Gaussian Stochastic Extreme Offshore Structural Response using FMNS <sub>NL</sub>	110
4.2.1.1	Short-term 100-year response without current	111

4.2.1.2	Short-term 100-year response with the presence of current	126
4.2.2	Sampling Variability Analysis	139
4.2.3	Long-Term Probability Distribution of the Non-Gaussian Stochastic Extreme Offshore Structural Response using FMNS <sub>NL</sub>	142
4.2.3.1	Comparison of Long-term Probability Distribution between Linear and Nonlinear Analysis	148
4.3	Efficiency of FMNS <sub>NL</sub> Method	153
4.4	Summary	154
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>157</b>
5.1	Introduction	157
5.2	Conclusion	158
5.2.1	RO 1: To investigate the significant impact of considering all nonlinearities in the evaluation of a non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structure.	158
5.2.2	RO 2: To develop a new model for a prediction of short-term 100-year responses for a non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structure.	159
5.2.3	RO 3: To validate the efficiency and accuracy of the new model by comparing them with the corresponding result from Monte Carlo time simulation technique for both short-term and long-term 100-year extreme responses	160
5.3	Recommendations	162
5.4	Research Output	163
5.4.1	Publication	163
5.4.2	Innovation	164
5.4.3	Intellectual Property	165
<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>167</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>		<b>179</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 2.1	Comparison between first and second-order wave analysis	31
Table 2.2	Development of response analysis based on the second-order nonlinear wave approach.	33
Table 2.3	Formulas for Second-order wave theory (Chakrabarti, 2005)	34
Table 2.4	Probability and cumulative density function according to the distribution	53
Table 2.5	Development of Probabilistic Method in Prediction of Extreme Offshore Structural Responses	59
Table 3.1	Comparison of 100-year response from 1 <sup>st</sup> order with 2 <sup>nd</sup> order wave theories using Monte Carlo time simulation, for low sea state condition ( $H_s = 5\text{ m}$ )	75
Table 3.2	Comparison of 100-year response from 1 <sup>st</sup> order with 2 <sup>nd</sup> order wave theories using Monte Carlo time simulation, for moderate sea state condition ( $H_s = 10\text{ m}$ ).	76
Table 3.3	Comparison of 100-year response from 1 <sup>st</sup> order with 2 <sup>nd</sup> order wave theories using Monte Carlo time simulation, for high sea state condition ( $H_s = 15\text{ m}$ ).	76
Table 3.4	Coefficient of determination, $r^2$ and correlation coefficient values, $r$ based on model development, drag-induced quasi-static responses, $H_s = 15\text{ m}$ $\bar{U} = 0.00\text{ m/sec}$ .	86
Table 3.5	Measured scatter diagram for the Forties Field of the North Sea (Provided by the Health and Safety Executive, UK)	96
Table 3.6	Total number of sea states for each band of significant waveheights	99
Table 3.7	Extended scatter diagram for the Forties Field of the North	101
Table 4.1	Comparison of 100-year responses from FMNS <sub>NL</sub> with Monte Carlo time simulation for various sea state conditions, and without current ( $\bar{U}=0.00\text{ m/sec}$ ).	112
Table 4.2	Correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) between response from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods for various sea state conditions, and without current ( $\bar{U}=0.00\text{ m/sec}$ ).	112

Table 4.3	Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) of FMNS <sub>NL</sub> model for low, moderate and high sea state condition by neglecting the presence of current ( $\bar{U}=0.00$ m/sec).	113
Table 4.4	Comparison of 100-year responses from FMNS <sub>NL</sub> with Monte Carlo time simulation for various sea state conditions, and with the presence of positive current ( $\bar{U} = +0.90$ m/sec).	127
Table 4.5	Comparison of 100-year responses from FMNS <sub>NL</sub> with Monte Carlo time simulation for various sea state conditions, and with the presence of negative current ( $\bar{U} = -0.90$ m/sec).	128
Table 4.6	Correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) between response from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods for various sea state conditions, and with the presence of positive current ( $\bar{U} = +0.90$ m/sec).	128
Table 4.7	Correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) between response from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods for various sea state conditions, and with the presence of negative current ( $\bar{U} = -0.90$ m/sec).	129
Table 4.8	Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) of FMNS <sub>NL</sub> model for various sea state conditions, and the presence of positive current ( $\bar{U} = +0.90$ m/sec).	129
Table 4.9	Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) of FMNS <sub>NL</sub> model for various sea state conditions, and with the presence of negative current ( $\bar{U} = -0.90$ m/sec).	129
Table 4.10	Sampling variability analysis for short-term probability distribution of quasi-static base shear extreme values using FMNS <sub>NL</sub> .	142
Table 4.11	Comparison of 100-year response from Monte Carlo time simulation with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods	143
Table 4.12	Comparison of 100-year response from FMNS with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods	149

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 2.1	Failure rate represent by the bathtub curve concept	12
Figure 2.2	Load-strength interference failure rate model	14
Figure 2.3	The distribution of wave energy spectrum according to its significant wave height	17
Figure 2.4	Comparison of the JONSWAP and Pierson Moskowitz spectrum	19
Figure 2.5	Waves Properties	19
Figure 2.6	Range of validity for various wave theories (Le Méhauté, 1976)	21
Figure 2.7	Wave profile and particle paths for solitary wave	25
Figure 2.8	Wave crest with relation to the water particle orbits	27
Figure 2.9	Particle trajectories for circular and elliptical orbits	28
Figure 2.10	Behaviour of interaction and interference standing waves	30
Figure 2.11	Formation of Nonlinear Wave Simbucket Simulation. (Andersen, 2015)	30
Figure 2.12	Wave kinematic profile based on empirical stretching methods	40
Figure 2.13	Hydrodynamic coefficient with respect to flow parameter (Chakrabarti, 2005)	43
Figure 2.14	Distribution of forces on a single leg structure	46
Figure 2.15	Research gap	64
Figure 3.1	Research Flowchart	66
Figure 3.2	A sample of surface elevation of first-order and second-order wave analysis, $H_s=15$ m.	69
Figure 3.3	Evaluation of second-order offshore structural response based on Monte Carlo time simulation method	70
Figure 3.4	A sample of total quasi-static base shear for $H_s=5$ m	71
Figure 3.5	A sample of total quasi-static base shear for $H_s=15$ m	72

Figure 3.6	Comparison of responses frequency spectra from first-order and second-order wave analysis, total quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m	72
Figure 3.7	A procedure of simulation short-term probability distribution of extreme responses value using Monte Carlo time simulation method	73
Figure 3.8	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from first-order and second-order wave analysis, 10 000 sample records, drag-induced quasi-static overturning moment, $H_s=10$ m, current = -0.90 m/sec	75
Figure 3.9	The structure of FMNS <sub>NL</sub> method	78
Figure 3.10	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	81
Figure 3.11	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses with its corresponding model: drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	83
Figure 3.12	Relationship of (nonlinear) drag-induced quasi-static base shear between Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> : model 1, $H_s=15$ m.	84
Figure 3.13	Relationship of (nonlinear) drag-induced quasi-static base shear between Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> : model 2, $H_s=15$ m.	84
Figure 3.14	Relationship of (nonlinear) drag-induced quasi-static base shear between Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> : model 3, $H_s=15$ m.	85
Figure 3.15	Relationship of (nonlinear) drag-induced quasi-static base shear between Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> : model 4, $H_s=15$ m.	85
Figure 3.16	Comparison of response frequency spectra from Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> : model 4, drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m.	87
Figure 3.17	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: inertia-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec.	88
Figure 3.18	Relationship of (nonlinear) inertia-induced quasi-static base shear between Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> , $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec.	89
Figure 3.19	Relationship of (nonlinear) total quasi-static base shear between Monte Carlo time simulation method with FMNS <sub>NL</sub> , $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec.	90

Figure 3.20	A procedure of evaluation extreme offshore structural response using FMNS <sub>NL</sub>	91
Figure 3.21	Short-term probability distribution of extreme response values using FMNS <sub>NL</sub> method, 10 000 response records, quasi-static drag-induced base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	94
Figure 3.22	Probability distribution of significant waveheight for the observed scatter diagram of Forties Field	98
Figure 3.23	Prediction of 100-year Extreme Offshore Structural Responses	104
Figure 3.24	Test structure	106
Figure 4.1	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, quasi-static drag-induced base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	114
Figure 4.2	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: quasi-static drag-induced base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	114
Figure 4.3	Comparison of response frequency spectra using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: quasi-static drag-induced base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	115
Figure 4.4	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, quasi-static drag-induced base shear, $H_s=5$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	116
Figure 4.5	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: quasi-static drag-induced base shear, $H_s=5$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	117
Figure 4.6	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=5$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	117
Figure 4.7	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, quasi-static inertia-induced overturning moment, $H_s=5$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	118
Figure 4.8	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, quasi-static inertia-	

	induced overturning moment, $H_s=10$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	119
Figure 4.9	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, quasi-static inertia-induced overturning moment, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	119
Figure 4.10	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: inertia-induced quasi-static overturning moment, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	120
Figure 4.11	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: total quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	121
Figure 4.12	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: total quasi-static base shear, $H_s=10$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	122
Figure 4.13	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: total quasi-static base shear, $H_s=5$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	122
Figure 4.14	Relationship between extreme quasi-static base shear and extreme surface elevation; $H_s=15$ m, duration = 128 sec.	123
Figure 4.15	Relationship between extreme quasi-static base shear and extreme surface elevation; $H_s=10$ m, duration = 128 sec.	124
Figure 4.16	Relationship between extreme quasi-static base shear and extreme surface elevation; $H_s=5$ m, duration = 128 sec.	124
Figure 4.17	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, total quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	125
Figure 4.18	Comparison of response frequency spectra using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: total quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	126
Figure 4.19	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	130
Figure 4.20	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	131



Figure 4.21	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = 0.00 m/sec	132
Figure 4.22	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: drag-induced quasi-static base shear, $H_s=15$ m, current = -0.90 m/sec	132
Figure 4.23	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, inertia-induced quasi-static overturning moment, $H_s= 5$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	134
Figure 4.24	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: inertia-induced quasi-static overturning moment, $H_s= 5$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	134
Figure 4.25	Relationship between nonlinear and linearized responses: inertia-induced quasi-static overturning moment, $H_s=5$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	135
Figure 4.26	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, total quasi-static base shear, $H_s= 5$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	136
Figure 4.27	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, total quasi-static base shear, $H_s= 5$ m, current = -0.90 m/sec	136
Figure 4.28	Comparison of probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 10 000 response records, total quasi-static base shear, $H_s= 15$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	137
Figure 4.29	Comparison of response values using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: total quasi-static base shear, $H_s= 15$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	138
Figure 4.30	Comparison of response frequency spectra using from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods: total quasi-static base shear, $H_s= 15$ m, current = +0.90 m/sec	138
Figure 4.31	Probability distribution of extreme response values for quasi-static base shear using FMNS <sub>NL</sub> ; 10,000 extreme response records for $H_s = 5$ m.	140
Figure 4.32	Probability distribution of extreme response values for quasi-static base shear using FMNS <sub>NL</sub> ; 1,000 extreme response records for $H_s = 5$ m.	141

Figure 4.33	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, inertia-induced quasi-static overturning moment, current = 0.00 m/sec.	145
Figure 4.34	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, drag-induced quasi-static base shear, current = 0.00 m/sec.	145
Figure 4.35	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, drag-induced quasi-static base shear, current = +0.90 m/sec.	146
Figure 4.36	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, drag-induced quasi-static base shear, current = -0.90 m/sec.	147
Figure 4.37	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, total quasi-static base shear, current = +0.90 m/sec.	148
Figure 4.38	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from FMNS and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, drag-induced quasi-static base shear, current = -0.90 m/sec.	150
Figure 4.39	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation, FMNS and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, total quasi-static base shear, current = 0.00 m/sec.	151
Figure 4.40	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation, FMNS and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, drag-induced overturning moment, current = 0.00 m/sec.	152
Figure 4.41	Comparison of long-term probability distribution of extreme response values from Monte Carlo time simulation, FMNS and FMNS <sub>NL</sub> methods, 1000 response records, inertia-induced overturning moment, current = 0.00 m/sec.	152

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

API	-	American Petroleum
BS	-	Base Shear
DFT	-	Discrete Fourier Transform
ETS	-	Efficient Time Simulation
ETU	-	Efficient Threshold Upcoming
FFT	-	Fast Fourier Transform
FMNS	-	Finite-memory Nonlinear System
FORM	-	First Order Reliability Method
FOSM	-	First Order Second Moment
GDP	-	Gross Domestic Product
GNI	-	Gross National Income
ISO	-	Industrial Standardized Organization
JONSWAP	-	Joint North Sea Wave Project
LHS	-	Latin Hypercube Sampling
MC	-	Monte Carlo
MWL	-	Mean Water Level
NKEA	-	National Key Economic Area
OTM	-	Overturning Moment
PCT	-	Principle Component Technique
PDF	-	Probability Distribution Function
PM	-	Pierson Moskowitz
QRA	-	Quantitative Risk Analysis
SA	-	Simulated Annealing
SORM	-	Second Order Reliability Method
SRA	-	Structural Reliability Analysis
USFOS	-	Ultimate Strength for Framed Offshore Structures

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$A$	-	amplitude
$\hat{\tilde{R}}$	-	approximate value on (nonlinear) offshore structural response
$r$	-	correlation coefficient
$r^2$	-	coefficient of determination
$\bar{U}$	-	current
$C_D$	-	drag coefficient
$\tilde{R}_{L,d}''$	-	drag-induced second-order linearized quasi-static responses
$\tilde{R}_d''$	-	drag-induced second-order (nonlinear) quasi-static responses
$z$	-	elevation from seabed
$e_r$	-	extreme value residues
$ee$	-	error
$g$	-	gravitational acceleration
$\tilde{R}_i''$	-	inertia-induced second-order (nonlinear) quasi-static responses
$\tilde{R}_{L,i}''$	-	inertia-induced second-order linearized quasi-static responses
$C_M$	-	inertia (mass) coefficient
$T_z$	-	mean zero upcrossing period
$m$	-	metre
$F$	-	Morison's force
$g(\tilde{R}_L'')$	-	nonlinear function
$\omega_p$	-	peak angular frequency
$\gamma_p$	-	peak enhancement
$\varphi$	-	phase angle
$e$	-	relative surface roughness
$SS_{res}$	-	residual sum of squares
$Re$	-	Reynold number
$H_s$	-	significant wave height
$\eta(t)$	-	surface elevation
$\eta''(t)$	-	surface elevation second-order analysis
$G_{\eta\eta}$	-	surface elevation frequency spectrum

$SS_{tot}$	-	total sum of squares
$f$	-	wave frequency
$H$	-	wave height
$T$	-	wave period
$L$	-	wave length
$d$	-	water depth
$\vartheta$	-	wave direction
$k$	-	wave number
$u, v$	-	water particle velocity
$\dot{u}$	-	water particle acceleration

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

The oil and gas industry is the engine of the world economy. Its production, especially in the energy sector, contributes about 4.6% - 6.5% to the global economy, with gross domestic product (GDP) ranging from \$77 trillion to \$107 trillion as of 2014 (Deloitte, 2014). Currently, with the rising global demand for energy resources, the oil and gas industry is facing a massive challenge as its resources are declining.(Deloitte, 2015; Veolia, 2016). All major oil and gas operators (i.e. PETRONAS, SHELL, ARAMCO, etc.) are focusing on minimizing the operational cost of oil and gas platforms and enhancing their performance (Stacey *et al.*, 2008; Ayob *et al.*, 2014; Deloitte, 2014; Fayazi and Aghakouchak, 2015).

As an alternative to high development costs, oil and gas operators are looking forward to improving their recovery of oil and gas resources from developed fields, and to develop discovery reserves from existing oil and gas platforms, which will result in good project economics and would allow recovery of more oil and gas resources. Globally, there are 497 operational offshore platforms, with 184 located around the North Sea region (Statista, 2018). However, as reported by John & John (2008), there exist around 110 fixed platforms which are older than 20 years, in the Norwegian and UK sectors. Stephen (2014) claimed that at the Southern North Sea, 70 installations are older than expected. In Malaysia, 42.5% of 360 platforms have operated for more than 30 years, as recorded in 2017, and the percentage is expected to steadily increase with time (Health and Safety Executive, 2017; Mat Soom, 2019; Zawawi, 2020).

In general, a platform is classified as an ageing structure when it has operated beyond its initial design life of 20 to 25 years. Although it is not merely about the

physical age, the risk of ageing begins once the platform enters the sea. Thus, aging is measured according to the platform's condition and its structural integrity. Based on regular inspection, a platform with ageing symptoms requires a decision on whether to decommission or extend its service life (Palkar & Markeset, 2012). Referring to the current record, the decommissioning in the North Sea was estimated at £24 billion between 2018 and 2022, while in the Asia-Pacific region, the potential cost for this could rise above £78 billion (Rowe, 2019). Therefore, life extension is more economical and productive than decommissioning platform (Clyde & Co, 2016). However, the reassessment of structural integrity is required to verify whether the requirements of serviceability and global safety (unity check) are fulfilled based on the structural reliability analysis (Khan *et al.*, 2019).

Structural reliability analysis (SRA) methods are used to comprehensively assess the effects of uncertainties in the load actions, resistances and modelling of certain parts of a structure and its performance. SRA offers assessments at the structural components level as well as the entire structural system. Additionally, SRA may be useful in the (re) calibration of partial action and resistance factors for exceptional or unusual circumstances, decision analysis to support the inspection and monitoring programs, and situations where the structural assessment of existing structures is needed. Hence, accurate information on the design level, and ultimate strength of the platform under normal (operation) and extreme loading conditions are essential to support the details of reassessment (Stacey *et al.*, 2008; Fayazi and Aghakouchak, 2015).

An offshore structure is subjected to several categories of loads; accidental, permanent, deformation, live, and environmental loads (Chakrabarti, 2005). However, according to the API standard design code (2014) for fixed offshore platforms, an extreme environmental condition is the main parameter in formulating the platform design load according to its service life. Wind generated random wave loads are the major consideration in the design stage, while wind load itself only contributes less than 5% of total environmental loading (Hagen, 1996, Varma, 2014). Thus, an iterative method with an accurate wave load model is necessary (Zhang, 2015).

The reliability analysis of fixed offshore structures can be measured either through deterministic or probabilistic methods. While these structures can be designed by exposing them to extreme regular waves for a 100-year return period ( Holmager, 2010; Hafez *et. al.*, 2012; Mallahzadeh *et al.*, 2014; Mat Soom *et al.*, 2015; Abu Husain, 2015), it is much more satisfactory to use the probabilistic approach to account for the inherent randomness of the wave loading. The evaluation of extreme offshore structural responses can be carried out using a linear or nonlinear analysis based on the selected wave theory ( Teng & Ning, 2009; Isobe, 2013; Varma, 2014).

Linear wave theory is the most frequently used as it is the most straightforward wave theory that allows the boundary condition to be linearized (Chakrabarti, 2005). However, it is well known that there exists a nonlinearity of the wave loading due to the drag component which gives a significant effect on both the frequency spectrum and probability distribution of extreme response values (Zheng, 2013; Abdel Raheem, 2014). Furthermore, structural dynamics effects, the presence of current and load intermittency in the splash zone also increase the complexity of the problem. This provides limitations on the applications of linear wave theory since some of the nonlinearities cannot be explained when higher order terms are excluded (Chen, 2014). As a solution, the nonlinear wave approach is more applicable. In line with the development of scientific knowledge on the nonlinear wave, several researchers have come out with various methods to perform a reliability analysis of offshore platforms, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Structural integrity assessment is essential to ensure that the operation of an offshore platform has fully satisfied the requirement of serviceability according to its lifespan. The evaluation needs to be carried out for an all limit state, and according to the framework (Aeran *et al.*, 2017), one of the critical processes is in the evaluation of loading and structural analysis. These include operational loads that are recommended based on the design standards, and environmental loads which contribute mainly by



wind-generated random waves. Here, the 100-year return period of extreme offshore structural responses is applied for ultimate limit state assessment based on the requirement by code of practice.

It is advisable to analyze the structure based on linear wave analysis as a preliminary analysis to ascertain the overall integrity of the structure. Based on a probabilistic approach, the structural analysis can be evaluated using time, frequency or probability domain (Najafian *et al.*, 1995; Cheng, 2002; Najafian, 2007c; Zheng, 2013; Abu Husain, 2015). Referring to the design standard code of practices API-RP2A (2014) and ISO19902 (2010), frequency domain analysis is commonly applied in offshore oil and gas industries to analyze extreme wave responses as it is computationally more efficient (Zhang, 2015; Rahmati, 2016; DNV.GL, 2018).

In cases where the preliminary analysis results are found to be severe with plenty of critical conditions (i.e., overstressed member), performing a nonlinear wave is recommended for more detailed structural analysis. In fact, simulations based on linear wave theory give significant underprediction compared to nonlinear analysis (Agarwal & Manuel, 2011; Zheng, 2013; Natarajan, 2014). However, it becomes complicated when dealing with the nonlinear wave simulations, in which the wave profile is generated based on the combination of first and second order wave components, where the second wave experiences twice the wave frequency. The solution becomes cumbersome when a large number of elements are used to obtain a reliable higher-order wave force and its structural response (Deo, 2013). However, it provides an accurate prediction in the simulation of extreme response values (Alberello *et al.*, 2014; Chen, 2014; Saeedfar & Abd Wahab, 2015; Adcock, 2015).

Recently, researchers have shown an increased interest in the prediction of statistical properties of offshore structures according to nonlinear wave in a stochastic nature. Ersdal (2005) and Puskar *et al.* (2006) first examined a primary concern on loading assessment which led to structural failure using nonlinear analysis with the aid of Ultimate Strength for Framed Offshore Structures (USFOS) to enhance its efficiency. Later, Ebrahimian *et al.* (2014) provided a more detailed study of contributing factors that influence uncertainty in the evaluation process. However, the

weakness in the frequency domain technique is due to its reduced accuracy when dealing with a complex nonlinear mechanism such as more extreme met-ocean conditions (Armstrong *et al.*, 2017). In such situations, time domain analysis such as the Monte Carlo time simulation will be chosen due to their level of accuracy (Swain & Schmeiser, 1987; Norouzi, 2012; Catelani *et al.*, 2014).

However, time domain techniques are not efficient as tens of thousands of realizations need to be committed to remove the sampling variability (Abu Husain *et al.*, 2016). This leads to computational demand and consequently, a huge investment cost. Most researchers focus on improving the efficiency of the time domain technique by integrating the Monte Carlo procedure with other methods such as Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) and Simulated Annealing (SA) approaches that aim to optimize the sample size (Helton *et al.*, 2006; Vořechovský & Novák, 2009; Ebrahimian *et al.*, 2014). Later in this research, an advanced method has been developed for better accuracy and efficiency on the prediction of probabilistic responses based on time domain technique such as new wave theory (Tromans *et al.*, 1991; Cassidy, 1999; Cassidy *et al.*, 2001), efficient time simulation (ETS) (Abu Husain, 20013; Lambert *et al.*, 2013; Mallahzadeh *et al.*, 2014) and finite-memory nonlinear system (FMNS) (Najafian, 2007a, 2007b; Najafian & Mohd Zaki, 2008; Mohd Zaki *et al.*, 2013; Mukhlas *et al.*, 2016), with its corresponding development. However, most of the methods had been developed based on linear wave theory.

Hence, the existing research work can be grouped into two; the fundamentals of nonlinear wave theory that use frequency domain in the probabilistic analysis, and the development of the time domain method for better efficiency. There is a lack of studies focusing on nonlinear wave modelling with an efficient method for full probabilistic analysis. With the most attentive development of FMNS method, a new model needs to be developed to integrate the current development of FMNS (Mukhlas *et al.*, 2018) with nonlinear wave model. As mentioned before, there exists a nonlinearity of the wave loading due to the drag component, which has a significant effect on both, the frequency spectrum and probability distribution of extreme response values (Zheng, 2013; Abdel Raheem, 2014). Furthermore, the structural dynamics effect, and the presence of current and load intermittency in the splash zone also

increases the complexity of the problem. Yet, the contribution of nonlinearity due to the wave-wave interaction leads to a more cumbersome solution. Hence, this research will take advantage of the efficiency of the finite-memory nonlinear system (FMNS) that is able to reduce the computational effort by using an appropriate model to transform the surface elevation into approximate responses without sacrificing its accuracy. Details of the development of the model will be discussed. The most appropriate model can then be used with excellent efficiency and accuracy to determine the extreme offshore structural response. With that, the structure is optimized, leading to cost reduction.

### **1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Research**

This research attempts to develop an efficient model in the prediction of 100-year responses for a non-Gaussian stochastic analysis of the offshore structure without sacrificing its accuracy. In particular, the objectives are as follows:

1. To investigate the significant impact of considering all nonlinearities in the evaluation of a non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structure
2. To develop a new model for the prediction of short-term 100-year responses for a non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structure
3. To validate the accuracy and efficiency of the new model by comparing it with the corresponding result from Monte Carlo time simulation technique for both, short-term and long-term 100-year extreme responses

### **1.4 Scope of the Research**

The selection of a suitable offshore platform was made based on the water depth. A fixed offshore platform is fit for a depth of up to 400 m (also known as shallow water), and a floating offshore platform is used for deeper depths. The

industry commonly uses fixed offshore platforms for oil and gas production (Edvard, 2013; Technip, 2014). Locating a fixed offshore platform in shallow sea waters is still feasible and as a result, this research focused mainly on simulating the short-term and long-term probability distribution of extreme response values of a quasi-static fixed offshore platform according to the nonlinear random wave theory (structural data obtained from Atkins Ltd). It was also tested with and without the presence of a current (assuming  $\bar{U}= 0.0$  m/s and  $\bar{U}= \pm 0.9$  m/s as 1.0 m/s is the highest record of current at the north sea region (Moghimi *et. al.* 2005)). The environmental data chosen in this research is based on the extreme environment experienced by the structure (for North Sea region provided by Safety and Health Executive, UK), while the probability distribution of extreme response values was analysed based on the first excursion of failure due to the first upcoming extreme response.

This research focuses on the condition of North Sea due to available access data and its extreme condition that fits with the aim of research. However, the structure will be tested for various conditions of sea state (low, moderate, and high significant wave height with  $H_s = 5$  m, 10 m, 15 m, respectively). This is important to measure the workability of the model development to the local offshore platform that is located at the South China Sea region. There are three operating regions located in Malaysian waters, which are Peninsular Malaysia Operation (PMO), Sarawak Operation (SKO) and Sabah Operation (SBO). The hydro-meteorological environment represent by the NALL spectrum has classified South China Sea as a partially developed sea with a highest significant wave height of 5 m (Chu *et. al.*,2003; Khaidzi, 2016).

## **1.5 Significance of the Research**

This research could be of benefit to academics as well as the industry. Regarding academic, the findings from this research could enable the development of a new procedure for an accurate and efficient technique in the derivation of extreme non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structural response for further study. From the industry perspective, in general, the new methods can be used as an aid in the design and analysis of real offshore structures with high efficiency without sacrificing accuracy.

As previously mentioned, the oil & gas industries are experiencing a rise in global demand. As the cost of development is high, oil & gas operators are looking for ways to improve the recovery of resources from existing oil and gas platforms by extending their service life. It is the more economical and productive option since decommissioning requires a significantly large cost. However, structural integrity is a significant issue to ensure that the platform is operating well with a minimum chance of failure.

The non-Gaussian stochastic model from this research offers a more efficient nonlinear analysis procedure based on time domain method that has a significant impact on the integrity of the offshore structure. Since the technique provides a promising accuracy, the confidence level of analysis is dependently increased, which compensates for the low factor of safety during the assessment of structural analysis. With that, the structure is more optimized, leading to cost reduction.

Moreover, the developed model is robust and generic, which is assessable generally for all kinds of offshore structures (i.e., oil & gas platform, wind turbine, renewable energy equipment, etc.). In fact, it can also be applied for aerospace and other industries that are involved in the same concept of reliability required for optimization.

## 1.6 Thesis Outline

This thesis comprises of five chapters, namely the introduction, literature review, evaluation of extreme offshore structural responses, analysis and discussion of 100-year extreme offshore structural responses, and conclusion with recommendation. Chapter 1 outlines the aims and objectives of this research based on the problem encountered in the industry, then focuses into the specific scope of the study to ensure its completeness.

Chapter 2 discusses in detail the fundamental theory throughout the process of design and analysis of offshore structures that allows for the preservation of its reliability over the design life. Since the structure is subjected to the nonlinearities of random wave loading, accurate prediction of the statistical properties of its extreme response values is required. Therefore, several techniques will be discussed here in developing the probability distribution of extreme response values.

Chapter 3 is the simulation procedure part. An overall research flowchart is presented. According to the objectives of this research, a demonstration of the evaluation of extreme offshore structural responses based on linear and nonlinear wave theory using Monte Carlo time simulation method is done to investigate the importance of considering the nonlinearities in the analysis. This is followed by the model development of new approach due to the computational effort of Monte Carlo, by taking advantage of the efficiency of the finite-memory nonlinear system. Then, a full procedure based on the appropriate model in simulating a non-Gaussian stochastic offshore structural response is developed with a more efficient approach using a finite-memory nonlinear system known as the  $FMNS_{NL}$  method, according to short-term and long-term probability distribution.

Chapter 4 focuses on the analysis and discussion on the prediction of the 100-year response based on the evaluation of short-term and long-term probability distribution. The prediction has been examined using both Monte Carlo time simulation and  $FMNS_{NL}$  methods. The short-term distribution analysis is an initial indicator to observe the accuracy and efficiency performance of the  $FMNS_{NL}$  method

in predicting the 100-year extreme offshore structural responses, compared to the corresponding prediction using Monte Carlo time simulation method. The examination has been done according to low, moderate and high sea state conditions. Since it has provided a promising result, the analysis is proceeded with the long-term distribution analysis that considers the whole sea state condition based on the Forties Fields of the North Sea due to its occurrences of extreme waves. The analysis has also considered the contribution of current along the wave of propagation, either in the same or opposite direction. Additionally, the performance of  $FMNS_{NL}$  method has been evaluated based on its hydrodynamic components; inertia-induced, drag-induced and total responses. To discover the importance of considering the nonlinearity in the  $FMNS_{NL}$  method, a comparison with FMNS method has also been examined.

In the last chapter, which is Chapter 5, the conclusion and recommendations will be covered. This thesis has been concluded according to the listed objectives, while recommendations are based on the promising results that can be done for future work. In addition, the output of this research has also been summarized and categorised according to the publication of journals, conference proceedings, innovation for award and intellectual property.

## REFERENCES

- Abdel Raheem, S. E. (2014). Study on Nonlinear Response of Steel Fixed Offshore Platform Under Environmental Loads. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 39(8), 6017–6030.
- Abu Husain, M. K. (2013). *Prediction of Extreme Offshore Structural Response - An Efficient Time Simulation Approach*. United Kingdom: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.
- Abu Husain, M. K., Mohd Zaki, N. I., Johari, M. B., & Najafian, G. (2016). Extreme Response Prediction for Fixed Offshore Structure by Monte Carlo Time Simulation Technique. In *ASME 35th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, 1–7.
- Abu Husain, M. K., & Najafian, G. (2010). An Efficient Monte Carlo Simulation Technique for Derivation of the Probability Distribution of the Extreme Values of Offshore Structural Response. In *29th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering: Volume 2*, 369–375.
- Adcock, T. A. A. (2015). The Second Order Contribution to Wave Crest Amplitude - Random Simulations and NewWave. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Ocean and Polar Engineering Conference*.
- Aeran, A., Siriwardane, S. C., Mikkelsen, O., & Langen, I. (2017). A framework to assess structural integrity of ageing offshore jacket structures for life extension. *Marine Structures*, 56, 237–259.
- Agarwal, P., & Manuel, L. (2011). Incorporating irregular nonlinear waves in coupled simulation and reliability studies of offshore wind turbines. *Applied Ocean Research*, 33(3), 215–227.
- Airy, G. B. (1952). *Tides and Waves* (reprint). J.J Griffin.
- Alberello, A., Chabchoub, A., Gramstad, O., Babanin, A., & Toffoli, A. (2014). Statistics of Wave Orbital Velocities in Random Directional Sea States. In *19th Australasian Fluid Mechanics Conference*, 8–11. Melbourne. Australia.
- Andrews, D. (2013). Chapter 3: Regression and Correlation Learning Module. In *Statistic e-learning course*. Andrews University.
- Andersen, P. (2015). Wave Interaction. *Bozeman Science*, May 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Ansgar, N. (2010). Natural Frequency and Mode Shapes. *Lecture Note: Department of Architectural Engineering*, California Polytechnic State University.
- API RP2A (2014). *Recommended Practice for Planning, Designing and Construction of Fixed Offshore Platform Working Stress Design*, API RP2A-WSD (22nd ed.).
- Arar, S. (2017). An Introduction to the Fast Fourier Transform. *Technical Article in All About Circuits*, August 28<sup>th</sup>.
- Armstrong, C., Drobyshevski, Y., & Chin, C. (2017). Application of Frequency Domain Methods for Response Based Analysis of Flexible Risers. In *36th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering* (Vol. 3A).
- Ayob, M. S., Mukherjee, K., Kajuputra, A. E., Wong, B. S., & Salleh, F. M. (2014). Requalification of Offshore Jacket Structures in Malaysian Waters. In *Offshore Technology Conference*, 25–28.
- Azarhoushang, A. (2010). *Dynamic Response of Fixed Offshore Platforms to Environmental Loads*. A Thesis Submitted for the degree of Master of Philosophy of Curtin University of Technology.



- Aziz, E. S., Chassapis, C. (2014). Comparative Analysis of Tooth-root Strength using Stress-strength Interference (SSI) theory with FEM-based Verification. *Article in International Journal for Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM)*.
- Bateman, W. J. D., Swan, C., & Taylor, P. H. (2003). On the calculation of the water particle kinematics arising in a directionally spread wavefield. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 186(1), 70–92.
- Balan, G., Andras, I., Ilias, N. and Radu, S. M. (2015). New Methods of Mining Technological System's Performance Analysis. *An Article in Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 1317-1322.
- Borgman, L. E. (1967). Ocean Wave Simulation for Engineering Design. *ASCE Journal of Waterways and Harbours Division*, 557–583.
- Borthwick, A. G. L., Hunt, A. C., Feng, T., Taylor, P. H., & Stansby, P. K. (2006). Flow Kinematics of Focused Wave Groups on a Plane Beach in the U.K. Coastal Research Facility. *Coastal Engineering*, 53(12), 1033–1044.
- Bredmose, H., Agnon, Y., Madsen, P. A., & Schäffer, H. A. (2005). Wave Transformation Models with Exact Second-order Transfer. *European Journal of Mechanics, B/Fluids*, 24(6), 659–682.
- Bremer van den, T. S., & Breivik, Ø. (2017). Stokes Drift. *Philosophical Transactions Series A Mathematical, Physical, and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2111).
- Bremer van den, T., & Taylor, P. (2013). Stokes drift and net transport for two-dimensional wave groups in deep water. In *28th International Workshop on Water Waves and Floating Bodies*.
- Bremer van den, T., & Taylor, P. (2016). Lagrangian transport for two-dimensional deep-water surface gravity wave groups. *Proceeding of the Royal Society a Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Science*, 472(2192).
- Burrows, R. (1977). Quasistatic Response of Offshore Structures Using Probabilistic Methods. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 1, 325–332.
- Burrows, R. (1983). Expected Value Analysis for the Quasi-static Response of Offshore Structures. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 7(5), 317–328.
- Couto, M. F., Peternelli, L. A., & Barbosa, M. H. P. (2013). Classification of the Coefficient of Variation for Sugarcane Crops. *An Article in Crop Production*, 43(6), 957-961.
- Carassale, L., & Kareem, A. (2010). Modeling Nonlinear Systems by Volterra Series. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, (June), 801–818.
- Carlos, P., Soares, C. G., Hong, S.-W., Kishev, R., Kyojuka, Y., & Stansberg, C. T. (1998). *Final Report and Recommendations to the 22 nd ITTC*.
- Carmenes, R. S. (1996). Nonlinear regression. In *Signal Treatment and Signal Analysis Vol. 18*, 68–99. Elsevier B.V.
- Cassidy, M. J. (1999). *Non-Linear Analysis of Jack-Up Structures Subjected to Random Waves*. A Thesis Submitted for the degree of Doctore of Philosophy at the University of Oxford.
- Cassidy, M. J., Eatock Taylor, R., & Houlsby, G. T. (2001). Analysis of jack-ups units using a constrained NewWave methodology Cassidy.pdf. *Applied Ocean Research*, 23(4), 221–234.
- Cassidy, M. J., Houlsby, G. T., & Eatock Taylor, R. (2003). Probabilistic Models Applicable to the Short-Term Extreme Response Analysis of Jack-Up Platforms. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 125(4), 249.
- Cassidy, M. J., Taylor, P. H., Eatock Taylor, R., & Houlsby, G. T. (2002). Evaluation of long-term extreme response statistics of jack-up platforms. *Ocean Engineering*, 29(13), 1603–1631.

- Catelani, M., Ciani, L., Rossin, S., & Venzi, M. (2014). Failure Rates Sensitivity Analysis using Monte Carlo Simulation. In *13th IMEKO TC10 Workshop on Technical Diagnostics; Advanced Measurement Tools in Technical Diagnostics for System Reliability and Safety* (pp. 195–200).
- Chakrabarti, S. K. (1987). *Hydrodynamics of Offshore Structures*. USA: CBI Industries, Inc.
- Chakrabarti, S. K. (2005). *Handbook of Offshore Engineering*. Elsevier (Vol. I). Netherlands, UK: Elsevier.
- Chandrasekaran, S. (2015). Dynamic Analysis and Design of Offshore Structures. In *Proceeding of Ocean Engineering & Oceanography*. India.
- Chapra, S. C., & Canale, R. P. (2010). *Numerical Methods for Engineers* (Sixth). McGraw-Hill.
- Chen, B. Y., & Milburn, D. A. (1984). *The Effect of Nonlinear Wave Interactions on an Offshore Structure*. Washington, DC, USA: OCEANS, 1015-1019.
- Chen, J. (2014). *Nonlinear Wave Loads on Offshore Wind Support Structure*. A Thesis Awarded for Master of Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Cheng, P. W. (2002). A Reliability Based Design Methodology for Extreme Responses of Offshore Wind Turbines. *Delft University Wind Energy Research Institute*, 238.
- Cheng, Y., Li, J., & An, L. (2006). Stokes 5th-Order Internal Wave and Its Action on Cylindrical Piles. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference* (pp. 459–466).
- Chin, C. L. (2006). *A Reliability Analysis of a Malaysia Jacket Platform*. A Thesis Awarded for Master of Science, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Chu, P. C., Qi, Y., Chen, Y., Shi, P. & Mao, Q. (2003). Validation of Wavewatch-III using the TOPEX/POSEIDON Data. *Proceeding of SPIE Conference on Remote Sensing of the Ocean and Sea Ice*, Barcelona, Spain.
- Clyde & Co. (2016). Ageing North Sea Infrastructure: Insuring Operational and Decommissioning Risks. *European Union, UK*.
- Cooley, J. W., & Tukey, J. W. (1965). An algorithm for the machine calculation of complex Fourier series. *Math. Computation*, 19, 297–301.
- Cossa, N. J., Potty, N. S., Idrus, A. B., Hamid, M. F. A., & Nizamani, Z. (2012). Reliability Analysis of Jacket Platforms in Malaysia-Environmental Load Factors. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 4(19), 3544–3551.
- Couch, A. T., & Conte, J. P. (1997). Field Verification of Linear and Nonlinear Hybrid Wave Models for Offshore Tower Response Prediction. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 119, 158–165.
- Cyril, O., Roseline, F., & Akpos, E. (2013). Risk Based Deterministic Approach For Estimating Recoverable Volumes For Further Field Development Wells. *Society of Petroleum Engineer, SPE International*.
- Dalzell, J. F. (1999). A note on finite depth second-order wave-wave interactions. *Applied Ocean Research*, 21(3), 105–111.
- Das, P. K., & Zhang, W. (2003). Loads on Marine Structure. In *Guidance on Structural Reliability Analysis of Marine Structures* (pp. 80–96). University of Glasgow & Strathclyde.
- de Smith, M. J. (2015). STATREF: Statistical Analysis Handbook - A web-based Statistics Resource. Winchelsea, UK; The Winchelsea Press.
- Deloitte. (2014). *Vision 2040 - Global scenarios for the oil and gas industry*. Deloitte

- Touche Tohmatsu.*
- Deloitte, T. T. (2015). Oil and Gas Reality Check 2015: A look at the top issues facing the oil and gas sector. *The Creative Studio*, 1–28.
- Deo, M. C. (2013). *Waves and Structures*. Mumbai: Indian Institute of Technology Bombay.
- DNV-RP-C205. (2010). Environmental Conditions and Environmental Loads. *An Article of Software DNV.GL*
- DNV.GL. (2016). Hydrodynamic and Structural Analysis. *An Article of Software DNV.GL*
- DNV. GL. (2018). What is the Difference between a Frequency Domain and a Time Domain Mooring Analysis? *An Article of Software DNV.GL*
- Ebrahimian, H., Jalayer, F., Dominicus, R. De, & Manfredi, G. (2014). Probability-based Assessment of Jacket-type Offshore Platforms by Using Incremental Wave Analysis. In *EUROSTEEL*.
- Edvard. (2013). 5 Most Common Offshore Oil and Gas Production Facility Types. *Energy and Power, Oil and Gas Article*.
- Edvardsen, M. (2015). *Forces on Simplified Offshore Structure According to Different Wave Models*. A Thesis awarded for the degree of Master in Construction and Materials/ Offshore Construction. University of Stavanger, Norway.
- Elshafey, A. A., Haddara, M. R., & Marzouk, H. (2009). Dynamic Response of Offshore Jacket Structures under Random Loads. In *Proceeding of 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Marine Structure (MASTRUCT)*, 22(3), 504-521.
- Ersdal, G. (2005). *Assessment of existing offshore structures for life extension. Doctoral Thesis, University of Stavanger*.
- Fayazi, and Aghakouchak, A. (2015). Reliability Based Assessment of Existing Fixed Offshore Platforms Located in the Persian Gulf. *International Journal of Maritime Technology*, 4.
- Feng, W., Xiang, X., Jia, G., Dai, L., Gu, Y., Yang, X., Feng, Q. and Zhou, L. (2012). Applying the Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) to Improve Safety Management of Oil and Gas Pipeline Stations in China. *Proceeding of the 2012 9<sup>th</sup> International Pipeline Conference*.
- Fenton, J. (1990). Nonlinear wave theories. *The Sea -Ocean Engineering Science*, 9, 3–25.
- Forristall, G. Z. (2000). Wave Crest Distributions: Observations and Second-Order Theory. *Journal of American Meteorological Society*, 30(8), 1931–1943.
- Gobato, R., Gobato, A., & Fedrigo, D. F. G. (2016). Harnessing the energy of ocean surface waves by Pelamis System. *Parana Journal of Science and Education*, 2(February).
- Golpour, H., Zeinoddini, M., Khalili, H., Golbaz, A., Yaghoubi, Y., Adl, M. R., Ranjbar, P., Saberi, R. & Nikoo, H. M. (2013). Structural Integrity Assessment of Aging Fixed Steel Offshore Jacket Platforms: A Persian Gulf Case Study. In *32<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*.
- Guo, Q., & Xu, Z. (2011). Simulation of Deep-Water Waves Based on JONSWAP Spectrum and Realization by MATLAB. In *19<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Geoinformatics*.
- Hafez, K. A., Aboul-Fadl, W., & Leheta, H. W. (2012). Comparative Dynamic Response Analysis of a Fixed Offshore Platform Using Deterministic and Spectral Wave Approaches. In *Proceedings of the 31<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering* (pp. 1–9).
- Hagen, O. (DNV G. (1996). *Guideline for Offshore Structural Reliability Analysis:*

- Application to Jacket Platforms. Det Norske Veritas, report. Technical Report.*
- Haldar, A., & Mahadevan, S. (2000). *Reliability Assessment using Stochastic Finite Element Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Haritos, N. (2010). Modelling ocean waves and their effects on offshore structures. *Australian Earthquake Engineering Society 2010 Conference*, 1–7.
- Hasselmann, K., Barnett, T. P., Bouws, E., Carlson, H., Cartwright, D. E., Enke, K., Walden, H. (1973). *Measurements of wind-wave growth and swell decay during the Joint North Sea Wave Project (JONSWAP)*. Deutsches Hydrographisches Institut.
- Health and Safety Executive. (2017). Ageing and Life Extension of Offshore Installation. *An Article in Health and Safety Executive Website*. <https://www.hse.gov.uk/offshore/ageing>.
- Helton, J. C., Johnson, J. D., Sallaberry, C. J., & Storlie, C. B. (2006). Survey of Sampling-Based Methods for Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analysis. *Journal of Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 91 (10-11), 1175-1209.
- Holmager, M. (2010). *Offshore Book: An Introduction to the Offshore Industry*. Offshore Center Denmark.
- Hopkins, P., & Westwood, S. (2004). *Smart Pigs and Defect Assessment Codes: Completing the Circle*. United Kingdom; NACE International.
- Huan, W. Y. (2015). Structural Reliability of Jacket Platforms Using Second Order Reliability Method. Thesis for the Bachelor of Engineering (Hons.) Environmental Engineering, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman.
- Hughes, M. (2019). Introduction to Reliability in Electronics: Tools and Metrics for Anticipating Device Failure. *Technical Article* Irina, A., & Sergejs, A. (2007). Application of Ordinary Least Square Method in Nonlinear Models. *International Statistical Institute*, (1), 1–4.
- ISO 19902. (2010). *Petroleum and Natural Gas Industries- Fixed Steel Offshore Structures* (First Edit). IHS.
- Isobe, M. (2013). Review: Evolution of Basic Equations for Nearshore Wave Field. In *Japan Academy, Series B* (Vol. 89, pp. 34–50).
- Jamshidi, A., Rahimi, S. A., Ait-Kadi, D., & Ruiz, A. (2015). A comprehensive fuzzy risk-based maintenance framework for prioritization of medical devices. *Applied Soft Computing Journal*, 32(April), 322–334.
- Jan, H. Y., Chen, H. H., & Conlon, J. F. (1982). Dynamic Response Of Offshore Structures. In *Conference on Offshore South East Asia*. Singapore.
- Jensen, J. J., Baatrup, J., & Mansour, A. E. (1995). Second-order Wave Kinematics Conditional on a Given Wave Crest. *Applied Ocean Research*, 18, 119–128.
- Jiang, R. (2013). A new bathtub curve model with a finite support. *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 119, 44–51.
- Johari, M. B. (2017). *Optimisation of Efficient Time Simulation Method for the Prediction of Extreme Offshore Structural Response*. A Thesis Awarded for Master of Philosophy, University Teknologi Malaysia.
- John, M. (1999). *Reliability-Centered Maintenance*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- John, W., & John, S. (2008). *Requirements for Life Extension of Ageing Offshore Production Installations*. Norway: Petroleum Safety Authority Norway.
- Joung, T.-H. (2017). Performance Test Analysis and Structural Safety Assessment by using Reliability Analysis. In *International Conference on Ships and Offshore Structures* (pp. 1–36).
- Jusoh, I. (2018). Base Shear and Overturning Moment on Jacket Structure with Marine Growth. *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology (IJETT)*.

- Vol 58(1).
- Karadeniz, H. (2013). *Stochastic Analysis of Offshore Steel Structures*. London: Springer-Verlag.
- Kareem, A., Hsieh, C. C., & Ognarelli, M. A. (1998). Frequency-Domain Analysis of Offshore Platform in Non-Gaussian Seas. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 124 (6).
- Khaidzi, S. N. A. & Liew, M. S. (2016). Effect of Windspeed to Wave Height on Continental Shelf Malaysia. *Degree Thesis in Bachelor of Engineering (Civil), Universiti Teknologi Petronas*.
- Khan, R., Mad, A., Osman, K & Abd Aziz, M. A. (2019). *Chapter: Maintenance Management of Aging Oil and Gas Facilities*, Edited volume *Maintenance Management*. IntechOpen. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.82841.
- Kharif, C. (2009). Rogue Waves in the Ocean. In *Advanced in Geophysical and Environmental Mechanics and Mathematics*, 33–62.
- Konstantinidis, E., & Bouris, D. (2017). Drag and inertia coefficients for a circular cylinder in steady plus low-amplitude oscillatory flows. *Applied Ocean Research*, 65(July 2012), 219–228.
- Korteweg, D. J., & De, V. (1985). On the Change of Form of Long Waves Advancing in a Rectangular Canal, and on a New Type of Long Stationary Waves. *Philosophical Magazine*, 39(5), 422–442.
- Kriebel, D. L. (1990). Nonlinear Wave Interaction with a Vertical Circular Cylinder, 17(4), 345–377.
- Kurian, V. J., Ng, C. Y., & Liew, M. S. (2012). Dynamic responses of classic spar platforms subjected to long crested waves: Morison equation vs. diffraction theory. In *ICSSBE 2012 - Proceedings, 2012 International Conference on Statistics in Science, Business and Engineering* (pp. 524–529).
- Lambert, L. A., Najafian, G., Cooper, J. E., Abu Husain, M. K., & Mohd Zaki, N. I. (2013). Efficient Estimation of Offshore Structural Response Based on Threshold Upcrossing Rates. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 1–7.
- Lavis, J. (2018). Shallow, Mid to Ultra Deepwater Definitions. *An Article in Drillers.com*. Relentless Pursuit of Perfection. Ltd.
- Li, H., Wen, D., Lu, Z., Wang, Y., & Deng, F. (2016). Identifying the Probability Distribution of Fatigue Life using the Maximum Entropy Principle. *Entropy*, 18(4).
- Lin, R. Q., & Perrie, W. (1997). A New Coastal Wave Model. Part III: Nonlinear Wave-wave Interaction. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 27, 1813–1826.
- Longuet-Higgins, M. S., & Phillips, O. M. (1962). Phase velocity effects internary wave interactions. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 12, 133–135.
- Lyons, W., Plisga, G., and Lorenz, M. (2015). *Standard Handbook of Petroleum and Natural Gas Engineering*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Elsevier: Gulf Profesional Publishing.
- Naikan, V. N. (2009). *Reliability Engineering and Life Testing*. PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Maâtoug, M. A., & Ayadi, M. (2016). Numerical Simulation of the Second-order Stokes Theory using Finite Difference Method. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 55(3), 3005–3013.
- Mahmoudof, S. M., & Hajivalie, F. (2017). Introduction of a Simple Cnoidal Wave Formulation Based on Nonlinear Interaction of Wave-Wave Principles. *Internationa Journal of Coastal & Offshore Engineering*, 1(2).
- Mallahzadeh, H., Wang, Y., Abu Husain, M. K., Mohd Zaki, N. I., & Najafian, G. (2013). Efficient Derivation of the Probability Distribution of Extreme Responses

- Due to Random Wave Loading from the Probability Distribution of Extreme Surface Elevations. In *ASME 32nd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering* (pp. 1–8).
- Mallahzadeh, H., Wang, Y., Abu Husain, M. K., Mohd Zaki, N. I., & Najafian, G. (2014). Accurate Estimation of the 100-Year Responses From the Probability Distribution of Extreme Surface Elevations. In *ASME 33rd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*. San Francisco, California, USA.
- Marzocca, P., Nichols J.M., Milanese A., Seaverb M., & Trickeyb S.T. Second-order spectra for quadratic nonlinear systems by Volterra functional series: Analytical description and numerical simulation. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 22 (8) (2008), pp. 1882-1895
- Massel, S. R. (2005). *Ocean Surface Waves: Their Physics and Prediction* (Reprinted). World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.
- Mat Soom, E., Abu Husain, M. K., Mohd Zaki, N. I., Ayob, M. S., & Najafian, G. (2015). Global Ultimate Strength Assessment ( GUSA ) for Lifetime Extension of Ageing Offshore Structures. In *25th International Ocean and Polar Engineering Conference* (pp. 431–435).
- Mat Soom, E., Abu Husain, M. K., Mohd Zaki, N. I., Azman, N. U. and Najafian, G.(2016). Reliability-Based Design and Assessment for Lifetime Extension of Ageing Offshore Structures. In *Proceedings of the ASME 35<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*.
- Mat Soom (2018). *A Reliable Procedure for Load Coefficient Determination in Structural Reliability Assessment of Ageing Offshore Platforms*. A Thesis Awarded for Doctor of Philosophy, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Mei, C. C., Stiassnie, M., & Yue, D. K. P. (2005). *Theory and Applications of Ocean Surface Waves* (23rd ed.). World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.
- Melchers, R. E. (2002). *Structural Reliability Analysis and Prediction* (second). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Michelen, C., & Coe, R. (2015). Comparison of Methods for Estimating Short-Term Extreme Response of Wave Energy Converters. *Oceans 2015*, 1–6.
- Miskon, S. (2018). *PETRONAS Activity Outlook 2019-2021*. Petroleum Nasional Berhad (PETRONAS). Kuala Lumpur.
- Mohd Zaki, N. I., Abu Husain, M. K., Abdullah Shuhaimy, N., & Najafian, G. (2016). The Effect of Different Methods of Simulating Water Particle Kinematics on the 100-year Responses. In *35th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*.
- Moghimi, S., Gayer, G., Gunther, H. & Shafieefar, M. (2005). Application of 3<sup>rd</sup> Generation Shallow Water Wave Models in a Tidal Environment. *Journal of Ocean Dynamic*. 55 (1), 10-27.
- Mohd Zaki, N. I., & Najafian, G. (2010). Derivation of Water Particle Kinematics in the Near Surface Zone by the Effective Water Depth Procedure. In *29th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering: Volume 4* (pp. 295–300). <https://doi.org/10.1115/OMAE2010-20507>
- Mohd Zaki, N. I., Abu Husain, M. K., Mallahzadeh, H., & Najafian, G. (2013). Finite-Memory Nonlinear System Modelling of Offshore Structural Response Accounting for Extreme Values Residues. In *ASME 32nd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*.
- Mohd Zaki, N. I., Abu Husain, M. K., & Najafian, G. (2013). Comparison of Extreme Responses From Wheeler and Vertical Stretching Methods. *The Open Civil Engineering Journal*, 7, 273–281.

- Mohd Zaki, N. I., Abu Husain, M. K., Najafian, G., & Wang, Y. (2013). Short-Term Distribution of the Extreme Values of Offshore Structural Response By Modified Finite-Memory Nonlinear System Modeling. In *Proceeding of the ASME 32nd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering (OMAE)*.
- Mohd Zaki, N. I., Abu Husain, M. K., Mukhlas, N. A., & Najafian, G. (2016). Prediction of offshore structural response extreme values by modified finite-memory nonlinear system modeling. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering - OMAE* (Vol. 3).
- Morison, J. R., Johnson, J. W., & Schaaf, S. a. (1950). The Force Exerted by Surface Waves on Piles. *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, 2(5), 149–154.
- Mukhlas, N. A. (2017). *Efficient Derivation of Extreme Offshore Structural Response Exposed to Random Wave Load*. A Thesis Awarded for Master of Philosophy, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Mukhlas, N. A., Abdullah Shuhaimy, N., Johari, M. B., Mat Soom, E., Abu Husain, M. K., & Mohd Zaki, N. I. (2016). Design and Analysis of Fixed Offshore Structure – An Overview. *Malaysian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 28(3), 503–520.
- Mukhlas, N. A., Mohd Zaki, N. I., & Abu Husain, M. K. (2016). Prediction of the 100-year Responses by Advanced MFMNS. In *International Conference on Ocean, Mechanical and Aerospace for Scientist and Engineer*, 7–8.
- Mukhlas, N. A., Zaki, N. I. M., Husain, M. K. A., & Najafian, G. (2018). Efficient Derivation of Extreme Offshore Structural Response Exposed to Random Wave Loads. *Journal Ships and Offshore Structures*, 13 (7), 719-733.
- Mustaffa, Z., Gelder, P. Van, & Vrijling, H. (2009). A Discussion of Deterministic vs . Probabilistic Method in Assessing Marine Pipeline Corrosions. In *The International Society of Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference* (Vol. 1), 653–658.
- Naess, A., Gaidai, O., & Haver, S. (2007). Efficient Estimation of Extreme Response of Drag-dominated Offshore Structures by Monte Carlo Simulation. *Ocean Engineering*, 34(16), 2188–2197.
- Naess, A., & Pisano, A. A. (1997). Frequency Domain Analysis of Dynamic Response of Drag Dominated Offshore Structures. *Applied Ocean Research*, 19(5–6), 251–262.
- Najafian, G., Burrow, R., Tickell, R. G. (1995). A Review of the Probabilistic Description of Morison Wave Load and Response. *Journal of Fluids and Structures*, 9, 585–616.
- Najafian, G., Burrow, R., Tickell, R. G. (1999). Probabilistic Description of the Response of Offshore Structures to Wave Loading Via Random Sampling Technique. *International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference, IV*, 880653.
- Najafian, G., Burrows, R., Tickell, R., Metcalfe, A., & Hearn, G. (2000). Higher-order statistical moments of wave-induced response of offshore structures via Stratified and Importance sampling. In *19th International Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 687–694.
- Najafian, G., Tickell, R. G., Burrows, R., & Bishop, J. R. (2000). The UK Christchurch Bay compliant cylinder Project: Analysis and interpretation of Morison wave force and response data. *Applied Ocean Research*, 22(3), 129–153.
- Najafian, G., Burrows, R., Tickell, R. G., & Metcalfe, A. V. (2002). Higher-Order Statistical Moments of Wave-Induced Response of Offshore Structures Via Efficient Sampling Techniques. In *The Twelfth International Offshore and Polar*

- Engineering Conference* (Vol. 3), 465–470.
- Najafian, G. (2007a). Application of System Identification Techniques in Efficient Modelling of Offshore Structural Response. Part I: Model Development. *Applied Ocean Research*, 29(1–2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apor.2007.08.003>
- Najafian, G. (2007b). Application of System Identification Techniques in Efficient Modelling of Offshore Structural Response. Part II: Model Validation. *Applied Ocean Research*, 29(1–2), 17–36.
- Najafian, G. (2007c). Derivation of Statistical Properties of Wave-induced Offshore Structural Response by Principal Component Technique. *Ocean Engineering*, 34(7), 987–999.
- Najafian, G., & Mohd Zaki, N. I. (2008). Finite-memory Nonlinear System Modelling of Offshore Structures. In *27th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*.
- Najafian, G., Mohd Zaki, N. I., & Aqel, G. (2009). Simulation of Water Particle Kinematics in the Near Surface Zone. In *28th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, 157–162.
- Natarajan, A. (2014). Influence of second-order random wave kinematics on the design loads of offshore wind turbine support structures. *Renewable Energy*, 68, 829–841.
- Ning, D. Z., Teng, B., Zang, J., & Liu, S. X. (2008). A Fully Nonlinear Numerical Model for Focused Wave Groups. In *Proceeding 23rd International Workshop on Water Waves and Floating Bodies*.
- Ning, D. Z., Zang, J., Liu, S. X., Eatock Taylor, R., Teng, B., & Taylor, P. H. (2009). Free-surface Evolution and Wave Kinematics for Nonlinear Uni-directional Focused Wave Groups. *Ocean Engineering*, 36(15–16), 1226–1243.
- Noorzaei, J., Bahrom, S. I., Jaafar, M. S., Abdul Malik, W., & Mohammad, S. (2005). Simulation of Wave and Current Forces on Template Offshore Structures. *SURANAREE University of Technology*, 12(3), 193–210.
- Norouzi, M. (2012). *An Efficient Method to Assess Reliability under Dynamic Stochastic Loads*.
- Olagnon, M., Prevosto, M., & Joubert, P. (1988). Non-linear Spectral Computation of the Dynamic Response of a Single Cylinder. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 110(3), 278–281.
- Orkin, G., Folck, R., & Startzman, R. (1978). Monte Carlo Simulation of Offshore Terminal Operations. *Society of Petroleum Engineer, SPE International*. Retrieved from
- Palkar, S., Markeset, T. (2012). Extending the Service Life Span of Ageing Oil and Gas Offshore Production Facilities. *Proceeding of International Federation for Information Processing*, 213-221.
- Paltrinieri, N., Massaiu, S., and Matteini, A. (2016). *Chapter 15- Human Reliability Analysis in the Petroleum Industry: Tutorial and Examples of Dynamic Risk Analysis in the Chemical and Petroleum Industry*. Elsevier B.V. The Netherlands, Amsterdam, 181-192.
- Perrie, W., Susilo, A., & Toulany, B. (2010). A New Approximation for Nonlinear Wave-wave interactions. *Ocean Modelling*, 33(1–2), 159–176.
- Pierson, W. J., & Moskowitz, L. (1964). A Proposed Spectral Form for Fully Developed Wind Seas based on the Similarity Theory of S. A. Kitaigorodskii. *Journal Geophys Res.*, 69(24), 5181–5190.
- Purnomo, E. W. and Gosh, D. P. (2018). Identifying Shallow Water Flow in Offshore Malaysia using Multicomponent Data and FWI Approach. In *Proceeding of*



- Offshore Technology Conference.*
- Puskar, F. J., Spong, R. E., Ku, A., Gilbert, R. B., & Choi, Y. J. (2006). Assessment of Fixed Offshore Platform Performance in Hurricane Ivan. In *Proceedings of Offshore Technology Conference (OTC)*.
- Rafsanjani, H. M., & Sørensen, J. D. (2015). Reliability Analysis of Fatigue Failure of Cast Components for Wind Turbines. *Energies*, 8(4), 2908–2923.
- Rahmati, M. T. (2016). Comparison of Frequency Domain and Time Domain Methods for Aeromechanical Analysis. *International Journal of Rotating Machinery*. 1-12.
- Rahrooh, A., Buchana, W. W., & Seker, R. (2013). Linear Model Estimation of Nonlinear Systems Using Least-Squares Algorithm Linear Model. In *120th ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*. American Society for Engineering Education.
- Riise, B. H. (2009). Nonlinear Kinematics in Irregular Waves of Finite Depth. Thesis for the Degree of Master of Science in University of Oslo.
- Ringsberg, J. W., Heggelund, S., Hirdaris, S. E., & Taczala, M. (2015). Quasi-static Respose. *19th International Ship and Offshore Structures Congress*, 3(September 2015).
- Roberts, S. (2003). Lecture 7 - The Discrete Fourier Transform. In *Oxford Robots Lecture*, 82–96.
- Rocha, M. (2014). Nonlinearities of Waves Propagating over a Mild-slope Beach: Laboratory and Numerical Results. *Laboratory of Geophysical and Industrial Flows*.
- Rowe, M. (2019). The Terrifying Cost of Scrapping the World's Ageing Oil and Gas Rigs. *Geographical magazine*. Published in *Energy*. Ed. March.
- Sadeghi, K. (2007). An Overview of Design, Analysis, Construction and Installation of Offshore Petroleum Platforms Suitable for Cyprus Oil/Gas Fields. *Journal of Soc. & App. Sci.* 2(4), 1-16.
- Saeedfar, S., & Abd Wahab, A. K. (2015). An Evaluation of the Depth of Similarity between Linear and Non-linear Wave Theories. In *3rd International Conference on Water Resources*, 1–11.
- Sánchez-Silva, M., & Klutke, G.-A. (2016). Reliability of Engineering Systems. In *Reliability and Life-Cycle Analysis of Deteriorating Systems*, 21–45. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Sharma, J. N., & Dean, R. G. (1979). Second-Order Directional Seas and Associated Wave Forces. In *Offshore Technology Conference*, 2505–2510.
- Sharma, J. N., & Dean, R. G. (1981). Second-Order Directional Seas and Associated Wave Forces. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Journal*, 21(1), 129–140.
- Siddique, M. (2018). Wave Theory and Wave Propagation. In *Introduction to Coastal Engineering*. Lecture Material Department of Civil and Environment Engineering, University of Sharjah.
- Song, Z. F. (2017). Reliability Evaluation of Jacket-type Offshore Platforms Subjected to Wind , Wave , and Current Loads. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*.
- Sorenson, R. M. (2006). Finite Amplitude Waves. In *Basic Coastal Engineering* (pp. 53–77). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Spell, C. A., Zhang, J., & Randall, R. E. (1996). Hybrid Wave Model for Unidirectional Irregular Waves, Part II. Comparison with Laboratory Measurements. *Applied Ocean Research*, 18, 93–110.
- Srokosz, M. A. (1998). A New Statistical Distribution for the Surface Elevation of

- Weakly Nonlinear Water Waves. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 28, 149–155.
- Stacey, A., Birkinshaw, M., & Sharp, J. (2008). Life Extension Issues for Ageing Offshore Installations. In *International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering* (pp. 1–17).
- Statista. (2018). Offshore Oil Rigs Worldwide 2018 by Region.
- Stephen, P. (2014). Ageing North Sea Oil and Gas Platforms in the Spotlight. *Eastern Daily Press*, p. Dec 8.
- Stob, M. (2011). Non-linear Curve Fitting. In *Mathematics 241: Nonlinear Models* (pp. 1–3). Calvin College.
- Stokes, G. G. (1847). On the Theory of Oscillatory Waves. *Trans. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, 8, 441–455.
- Swain, J. J., & Schmeiser, B. W. (1987). Monte Carlo Estimation of the Sampling Distribution of Nonlinear Model Parameter Estimators. *Annals of Operations Research*, (8), 245–256.
- Taheri, A., & Jahangir, M. (2018). Reliability Assessment of a Fixed Jacket Platform by Monte Carlo Simulation Using Neural Network. *International Journal of Coastal & Offshore Engineering*, 1(3).
- Takeshi, M. (2013). A Monte Carlo Simulation Method for System Reliability Analysis. *Nuclear Safety and Simulation*, 4(1).
- Taniguchi, T., & Kawano, K. (2001). Current Effects on Extreme Response Value Statistics of Offshore Structures Subjected to Wave and Current. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference* (Vol. 111, 347–353).
- Taylor, P. H., Jonathan, P., & Harland, L. A. (1995). Time Domain Simulation of Jackup Dynamics with the Extremes of Gaussian Process. In *Proceeding of the 14th International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 313–319.
- Techet, A. H. (2005). Hydrodynamics. In *Marine Hydrodynamics* (3rd ed., pp. 1–9). MIT, Mechanical Engineering.
- Technip. (2014). *Offshore platform - facility provider*. Texas, USA: Technip USA, Inc.
- Teknomo, K. (2017). *Non-linear Transformation*. Tutorial in Revoledu Website, <https://people.revoledu.com/kardi/tutorial/>.
- Teng, B., & Ning, D. Z. (2009). A Simplified Model for Extreme-Wave Kinematics in Deep Sea. *Journal of Marine Science and Application*, 8(1), 27–32.
- Toffoli, A., Benoit, M., Onorato, M., & Bitner-Gregersen, E. M. (2009). The Effect of Third-order Nonlinearity on Statistical Properties of Random Directional Waves in Finite Depth. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 16(1), 131–139.
- Toffoli, A., Monbaliu, J., Onorato, M., Osborne, A. R., Babanin, A. V., & Bitner-Gregersen, E. (2006). Second-Order Theory and Setup in Surface Gravity Waves: A Comparison with Experimental Data. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 37(11), 2726–2739.
- Tognarelli, M. A., Zhao, J., Balaji Rao, K., & Kareem, A. (1997). Equivalent Statistical Quadraticization and Cubicization for Nonlinear Systems. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 123 (5).
- Torum, A., & Gudmestad, O. T. (1990). *Water Wave Kinematics*. Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Tromans, P. S., Anatruck, A. R., & Hagemeyer, P. (1991). New Model for the Kinematics of Large Ocean Waves Application as a Design Wave. In

- Proceedings of the First International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference* (Vol. 8), 64–71.
- Varma, K. K. (2014). Finite Amplitude Ocean Waves: Waves with Peaked Crests and Broad Troughs. *General Article*, (November), 1047–1057.
- Vidolova, M. (2014). *Investigation of Which Sea State Yield the Dominating Contribution to Fatigue Accumulation in Offshore Structures*. A Thesis Awarded for Master in Offshore Technology, University of Stavanger, Norway.
- Vořechovský, M., & Novák, D. (2009). Correlation control in small-sample Monte Carlo type simulations I: A simulated annealing approach. *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 24(3), 452–462.
- Wade, B. G., Dwyer, M., & Mcdermott, R. J. (1976). On the Application of Morison's Equation to Fixed Offshore Platforms. In *Offshore Technology Conference*.
- Wainwright, D. J., Ranasinghe, R., Callaghan, D. P., Woodroffe, C. D., Jongejan, R., Dougherty, A. J. & Cowell, P. J. (2015). Moving from deterministic towards probabilistic coastal hazard and risk assessment: Development of a modelling framework and application to Narrabeen Beach, New South Wales, Australia. *Coastal Engineering*, 96, 92–99.
- Wolfram, J., & Naghipour, M. (1999). On the estimation of Morison force coefficients and their predictive accuracy for very rough circular cylinders. *Applied Ocean Research*, 21(6), 311–328. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-1187\(99\)00018-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0141-1187(99)00018-8)
- Xiao, Y., Ye, J., Chen, R., & Tang, M. (2012). Research on Quantitative Model of Risk Assessment for Amusement Rides. In *2nd International Conference on Electronic & Mechanical Engineering and Information Technology*, 983–986.
- Xiong, J. J., & Sheno, R. A. (2011). Reliability and Confidence Levels of Fatigue Life. In *Fatigue and Fracture Reliability Engineering*. London: Springer-Verlag.
- Xu, Y., Xia, X., & Wang, J. (2012). Calculation and approximation of the cnoidal function in cnoidal wave theory. *Computers and Fluids*, 68, 244–247.
- Zeinoddini, M., Golpour, H., Khalili, H., Nikoo, H. M., & Ahmadi, I. (2017). Sensitivity Analysis of Selected Random Variables of Existing Offshore Jacket Structures in Persian Gulf. *International Journal of Coastal & Offshore Engineering*, (5), 15–24.
- Zawawi, W. N. A. (2020). Decision Support Technologies for Asset Late Life Planning. *Talk in Industry Meets Academia: Decommissioning & Abandonment (Late Life Planning & Preparation)*.
- Zhang, J., Chen, L., Ye, M., & Randall, R. E. (1996). Hybrid Wave Model for Unidirectional Irregular Waves, Part I. Theory and Numerical Scheme. *Applied Ocean Research*, 18, 77–92.
- Zhang, Y. (2015). Wave Loads on Offshore Wind Turbines. Master Thesis of Science in Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Zheng, X. Y. (2013). Nonlinear Stochastic Response of Offshore Structures: With Focus on Spectral Analysis. In *CESOS Highlight Conference & AMOS Vision*.
- Zheng, X. Y., Moan, T., & Quek, S. T. (2006). Numerical Simulation of Non-Gaussian Wave Elevation and Kinematics based on Two-dimensional Fourier Transform. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*.
- Zheng, X. Y., Moan, T., & Quek, S. T. (2007). Non-Gaussian Random Wave Simulation by Two-Dimensional Fourier Transform and Linear Oscillator Response to Morison Force. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering*, 129(4), 327.