

Guidelines for a Material Verification Program (MVP) for New and Existing Assets

1 Scope

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this recommended practice (RP) is to provide guidelines for an owner/user to develop and implement a material verification program (MVP) as part of an asset integrity program. The MVP uses positive material identification and other methods to verify that the nominal composition of an asset, an asset component, or weldment within the pressure envelope is consistent with the selected or specified construction materials.

A well-designed and well-implemented MVP is an important management system used to minimize the potential for release of hazardous substances due to nonconforming materials of construction.

1.2 About this Document

This recommended practice provides the guidelines for material verification programs involving ferrous and nonferrous alloys during the construction, installation, maintenance, and inspection of new and existing process equipment. It applies to metallic materials purchased for use either directly by the owner/user or indirectly through distributors, fabricators, or contractors, and includes the supply, fabrication, and installation of these materials.

This recommended practice is applicable to all refining and petrochemical industries, and may be applied in other industries and or businesses at the discretion of the owner/user. It is intended to be applied by any owner/user wishing to verify and/or validate that the materials of construction received, fabricated, and/or installed are in accordance with material and/or company specification(s).

1.3 Supersedes Notice

This version of API RP 578 (third edition) supersedes and wholly replaces the second edition (2010) of API RP 578 (*Material Verification Program for New and Existing Alloy Piping Systems*). The third edition contains many of the same paragraphs and language of the second edition, but it has been revised, reformatted, and re-visualized into a more encompassing document for all types of assets that may have an applicable material verification program.

2 Normative References

There are no documents considered to be normative for the application of this document. A bibliography can be found at the end of this document.

3 Terms, Definitions, and Acronyms

3.1 Definitions

3.1.1

alloy material

Any metallic material (including welding filler materials) that contains alloying elements, such as chromium, nickel, or molybdenum, that are intentionally added to enhance mechanical or physical properties and/or corrosion resistance. Alloys may be ferrous or nonferrous.

3.1.2**asset**

Property or equipment owned by a company that is either directly or indirectly involved with the manufacturing process.

3.1.3**distributor**

A warehousing supplier for manufacturers or suppliers of materials or components.

3.1.4**extent of examination**

The specified percentage of the number of items to be examined in an inspection lot.

3.1.5**fabricator**

An organization that utilizes the materials of construction affected by this recommended practice in order to create an asset.

3.1.6**heat**

A batch of metal made at the same time, able to be traced from its original constituents and manufacturing process.

3.1.7**inspection lot**

A group of items or materials of the same type from a common source from which a sample is to be drawn for examination.

NOTE An inspection lot does not include items from more than one heat.

3.1.8**lot size**

The number of items available in the inspection lot at the time a representative sample is selected.

3.1.9**material certifications (certificates of compliance)**

See "mill test report."

3.1.10**material manufacturer**

An organization that performs or supervises and directly controls one or more of the operations that affect the chemical composition or mechanical properties of a metallic material.

3.1.11**material nonconformance**

A positive material identification (PMI) result that does not conform with material specified.

3.1.12**material supplier**

An organization that supplies material furnished and certified by a material manufacturer, but does not perform any operation intended to alter the material properties required by the applicable material specification.

3.1.13**mill test report (MTR)**

A quality assurance document used in the steelmaking industry that certifies a material's compliance with appropriate standards, including physical and chemical specifications, and applicable dimensions. The MTR also includes a date of production and testing, and may include notation about method of fabrication. MTR's are sometimes called: material test certificates, (MTC), inspection certificates, certificates of test and by other

names. A mill test report is also known as: certified mill test report, certified material test report, mill test certificate (MTC), inspection certificate, certificate of test, and by other names. However, MTR is the term that is used in this document.

3.1.14

certified mill test report (CMTR)

An MTR verified by someone in addition to the certifying agent necessary in the issuance of that certification document.

owner/user

The organization that exercises control over the operation, engineering, inspection, repair, alteration, pressure testing, and rating of the assets.

3.1.14

pressure-containing components

Items that form the pressure-containing envelope of the equipment system.

3.1.15

positive material identification (PMI)

A physical evaluation or test of a material performed to confirm that the material that has been or will be placed into service is consistent with what is specified by the owner/user. These evaluations or tests may provide either qualitative or quantitative information that is sufficient to verify the composition.

3.1.16

random

Selection process by which choices are made in an arbitrary and unbiased manner.

3.1.17

representative sample

One or more items selected at random from the inspection lot that are to be examined to determine acceptability of the inspection lot.

3.1.18

standard reference materials

Sample materials for which laboratory chemical analysis data are available and are used in demonstrating the accuracy and reliability of a test instrument.

3.1.19

weld button (button)

a sample of welding filler material deposited on relevant base metal in order to provide basis for PMI of the filler.

3.2 Acronyms

API American Petroleum Institute

ASME American Society of Mechanical Engineers

ASTM American Society of Testing and Materials

LOQ limit of quantitation

MTR mill test report

MVP	material verification program
NACE	National Association of Corrosion Engineers
NCR	nonconformance report
PFI	Pipe Fabrication Institute
PIP	Process Industry Practices
PMI	positive material identification

4 Considerations and General Concerns

4.1 Carbon Steel Substitutions in Low-alloy Steel Systems

When considering the likelihood of material nonconformances, it is worth noting that, historically, the greatest number of material nonconformances with serious consequences have involved placing unapproved carbon steel components into low-alloy steel (e.g. 1¼Cr-½Mo, 2¼Cr-1Mo, 5Cr-½Mo, 9Cr-1Mo) piping systems.

4.2 Alloy Substitutions for Carbon Steel

When determining the need to perform material verification on carbon steel, the owner/user should evaluate the effect that the process stream could have on substituted materials. In some cases, the substitution of hardenable alloy materials for carbon steel has resulted in failure and loss of containment. Examples of such systems include those handling wet hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), hydrofluoric acid (HF), or sulfuric acid (H₂SO₄). Where material substitution could lead to failure and/or loss of containment, the extent of verification should be planned and/or increased in order to foster effectiveness, as well as validate the materials specified for use.

4.3 Stainless Steel and Nonferrous Substitutions Within High-alloy Systems

There is an assortment of stainless steels with varying compositions and varying corrosion resistances to different process streams. PMI should be considered by the owner/user depending upon the level of risk (probability and consequence of failure) based upon the potential damage mechanisms and damage rates associated with the installation of an unapproved high alloy during fabrication and installation. Examples of these situations include the substitution of stainless steels for Alloy 400 in HF Alkylation services, the substitution of a non-stabilized grade of stainless steel for a stabilized grade in a high-temperature service, or substitution of Type 304 SS for Type 316 SS where the molybdenum content is important for corrosion resistance, and where austenitic SS may have been substituted for duplex SS.

4.4 Residual Elements in Carbon Steels in Hydrofluoric Acid Alkylation Units

Carbon steels in some specific locations in HF acid service can experience increased corrosion rates based on the residual element (RE) content in the steels; e.g. Cr, Ni, Cu (refer to API RP 751). PMI methods can be used to assess the suitability of materials for HF service. Consideration should be given to the ability and/or accuracy of the PMI method to detect the various elemental concentrations, which are miniscule in comparison to the bulk analysis.

4.5 Process Units Susceptible to Sulfidation

Carbon steels with low silicon (Si < 0.10%) content can corrode at a greater rate than carbon steels with higher silicon (Si > 0.10%) content when exposed to hydrogen-free sulfidation conditions. These phenomena are discussed more extensively in API RP 571 and API RP 939-C. Owner/users with assets at risk from this type of degradation should consider the risks and the requirements needed to apply PMI material control in order to verify silicon levels and the effect on predicted corrosion rate. Alternatively, the owner/user may want to consider locating and conducting thickness measurements on all potentially susceptible carbon steel materials

in a circuit exposed to hot sulfidation in order to determine if low-silicon components originally installed may be resulting in higher corrosion rates than the rest of a piping circuit.

4.6 Gasket Materials

Gaskets in incompatible service may result in premature failures. The principles outlined in this document can be applied to gasket materials. The owner/user should define the material control methods to be used. The actual test procedures may be complex due to the construction of the gasket.

4.7 Refractory Installation Systems (Anchors)

Testing to verify that the refractory anchors match specifications should be considered by the owner/user. Material specifications and maximum design temperatures for selected materials are discussed in API Std 560.

5 Material Verification Programs

5.1 General

The owner/user shall establish a written material verification program indicating the extent and type of PMI to be conducted during the construction of new assets, retroactively on existing assets, and during the maintenance, repair, or alteration of existing assets.

For higher-risk systems, the owner/user should consider the need for employing a higher extent of in-process and final examination (up to 100 %) rather than random sampling, which may be more appropriate for lower-risk systems. The owner/user should also consider the need to conduct examinations after fabrication is complete at the point-of installation, to provide assurance that inadvertent substitutions did not occur.

5.2 Asset Components Included in a Material Verification Program

Examples of pressure-containing components exposed to process conditions that are found in equipment and systems that may require an MVP or PMI include but are not limited to:

- pipe lengths;
- pipe fittings, such as tees, elbows, reducers, caps, special pipe components, blinds, and plugs;
- flanges;
- forgings;
- valves—process valves, control valves, relief valves;
- pressure-containing welds;
- instrumentation (all pressure-containing parts);
- weld overlays, liners, and cladding;
- bolting;
- expansion joints and bellows;
- gaskets;
- rotating equipment pressure-containing components.

5.3 Mill Test Reports and Usage in an MVP

Mill test reports should not be considered a substitute for PMI because these type of documents have historically not always been accurate. However, mill test reports are an important part of an overall material quality assurance program.

5.4 Roles and Responsibilities

A material verification program may involve participation of several groups within the operating plant or the shop of a contractor, distributor, or fabricator. When establishing a material verification program, consideration should be given to the roles and responsibilities that each group has within the specific organization. These roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined and documented. In the operating plant, this can include those groups responsible for purchasing, engineering, warehousing/receiving, operations, reliability, maintenance, and inspection.

The owner/user or designee should specify the:

- a) extent of examination of new construction and existing assets, with consideration for the number of items to be examined;
- b) acceptable method(s) of examination;
- c) locations for examination, if applicable;
- d) examination results acceptance criteria;
- e) timing of examination in the work process;
- f) process for managing material nonconformances;
- g) qualification requirements for personnel performing PMI;
- h) method of documenting/identifying items that are acceptable for service.

5.5 New Construction MVP

5.5.1 General

This section addresses the fabrication stage, either in the shop or in the field, prior to the items being placed into service.

5.5.2 Material Verification Test Procedure Review

The owner/user or designee should review and approve the material verification program and the testing procedure(s) of the fabricator, material supplier, or third-party agency prior to testing.

5.5.3 Timing of Material Verification Testing

PMI should be performed at the point in time that helps ensure proper materials have been used in the fabrication of an assembly.

5.5.4 PMI of Components Supplied by a Distributor

A higher degree of PMI should be conducted on materials supplied by stocking distributors due to the potential for unapproved material substitutions as a result of frequent handling by a number of parties.

5.6 Existing Installed Assets MVP

5.6.1 General

This section addresses assets that are already in service where the material verification program procedures for the construction are not documented or not completed according to this RP. It is important to recognize that previous maintenance activities, as well as new construction practices, may influence the likelihood of unapproved materials substitutions.

5.6.2 Prioritizing Assets for Retroactive PMI

5.6.2.1 General Factors to Consider

If the owner/user elects to prioritize equipment or systems for the material verification program or needs to determine whether PMI is needed at all, the owner/user should consider the following:

- a) Likelihood of unapproved material substitutions during previous projects and maintenance activities: The effectiveness of the material verification program when these activities occurred is an important consideration.
- b) Consequences of a failure due to improper material being installed: Flammability and potential for spreading fire, toxicity, proximity to other equipment or community, temperature, pressure, mode of failure, and size of release should be considered.
- c) Reason for a specific material specification (i.e. corrosion resistance or product purity): This refers to the criticality of the material of choice.
- d) Historical data relating to unapproved material substitutions: This may be related to previous experience with material nonconformities in the process unit/operating plant or within published information available within the company and industry.

Taken together, these factors can be used to determine the risk associated with possible material nonconformances in an asset.

The owner/user should establish a methodology for estimating the relative priority for PMI within a given unit. This methodology may be based on a qualitative or quantitative risk analysis. API RP 580 discusses risk-based approaches and what should be considered when conducting a risk analysis (such as material, service conditions, service fluid, and mode of failure). The owner/user may also want to consider the opportunity to conduct PMI relative to upcoming planned maintenance opportunities (e.g. outages, turnarounds).

5.6.2.2 Site-specific Factors to Consider

Site-specific and/or experienced-based factors should be considered when prioritizing equipment or piping systems.

- Construction and maintenance practices: In assessing the likelihood of material nonconformances, the owner/user should also consider the materials handling, material control, and any PMI procedures followed during construction of the process unit. Process-unit maintenance procedures are also important. Process units in which rigorous procedures for material verification are used would be expected to have a lower likelihood of nonconformances.
- Reason for alloy specification: In some cases, alloys are used in equipment systems for reasons other than corrosion resistance or structural integrity. In these cases, the mechanical integrity of the system may not be compromised by material nonconformances. A material verification program may not be necessary in these systems. Two examples would be stainless steel lube oil systems in which stainless steel is used for maintaining oil purity, or stainless steel in a chemical manufacturing process where corrosion of carbon steel might cause product discoloration where any grade of stainless steel would be an acceptable substitution.

Based on experience, some types of components can have a higher likelihood of unapproved substitution of a nonspecified material. This can provide a basis for prioritizing specific equipment in a given system or process unit. Examples are:

- warm-up and bypass lines on pumps or check valves;
- small bore piping (2 NPS and below);
- valves, valve assemblies, and valve bonnets, and removable devices such as rupture disks, spacer blinds, blind flanges, plugs, or ring joint gaskets;
- thermowells;
- bolting;
- piping as a part of a packaged system;
- components without recognized marking;
- process systems with history of frequent maintenance requirements;
- welds;
- threaded components.

5.6.2.3 Factors to Consider When Determining the Extent of PMI

Factors to consider when determining the extent of PMI for existing assets include:

- a) historical inspection and material verification program records;
- b) number of plant modifications;
- c) materials control during original construction, equipment modifications, and maintenance activities;
- d) material verification program quality during construction and fabrication;
- e) failure mode and consequence of a loss of containment;
- f) likelihood of corrosion/degradation.

5.7 MVP as an Element of Maintenance Systems

5.7.1 General

The principles associated with materials verification as part of an installation of new equipment should also be applied to provide confidence that proper materials are being installed as part of maintenance activities. The concepts noted in 5.4 should be reviewed and applied as applicable to the maintenance function.

5.7.2 Responsibilities

It shall be the responsibility of the owner/user to evaluate maintenance systems so that material verification programs can be designed and implemented to effectively support the mechanical integrity needs of assets. The owner/user should establish a written procedure for the material verification program to be used for repair of assets during maintenance and turnaround activities.

5.7.3 Control of Incoming Materials and Warehousing

A material verification program should be directly applied to activities associated with receiving materials into a warehouse system. PMI may be performed as part of this receiving function, or, when appropriate, may be performed at the supplier's location as a condition of release for shipment. The material verification program that is adopted should provide for proper documentation and methods for indicating which materials have been tested and are approved for use.

The use of material verification program principles to check materials received into a warehouse system should be regarded as a quality assurance practice to minimize the potential for discovering an alloy material discrepancy during subsequent PMI. PMI within the warehouse should not be regarded as an alternative to PMI of the fabricated assets when PMI is specified.

5.7.4 Maintenance Activities

There are a number of in-service maintenance activities where material verification should be established. Some examples include, but are not limited to:

- a) Temporary removal of piping spool pieces, including the removal of blind flanges used for access: These activities need to be properly managed to minimize the potential for unapproved material substitutions. Incidents have occurred when same-size spool pieces were removed and reinstalled in the wrong locations. Consideration should be given to a material control system, such as "tagging" spools as they are removed, or the use of PMI prior to reinstallation to prevent these incidences from occurring
- b) Replacement of small bore threaded pipe nipples and plugs, frequently found as drains and vents in process areas: An immediate need may necessitate the installation of nonconforming materials in a temporary repair; it is important to recognize even small changes need to be documented and reported for possible future follow-up.
- c) Replacement of welded-in valves: Manufacturers/distributors may substitute low-alloy valves for carbon steel valves in higher-temperature/pressure services, and if this is not communicated, the craftsmen may end up using the incorrect welding procedure during installation. This error may produce cracks in the new welds.
- d) In turnaround situations where many heat exchangers in varying services are disassembled for cleaning, inspection, and repair: It is essential that all original components, or correct replacement components, are returned to the same exchanger during reassembly. An adequate marking and tracking system, as well as PMI, can be utilized to assure the proper components are returned to the correct service.
- e) When tower internals, such as tray parts (e.g. clips, tray flapper valves or bubble caps, and fasteners) are replaced, one may consider performing point-of-installation PMI (or other material control program) to assure the replacement parts are as specified.

It is important that repair procedures include consideration of PMI. Much of this can be controlled through awareness of the issues at all levels within the repair process. Consulting with those involved with implementing the programs where the repair will be performed, prior to commencement of work, can help ensure that systems, processes, and activities are in place to provide material control and verification.

6 PMI Methodology and Technology

6.1 General

A variety of PMI methods are available to determine the identity of alloy materials. The primary methods include portable spectroscopy and laboratory chemical analysis. A description of several test methods is listed below.

In addition to these methods, there are a variety of alloy sorting techniques that may be appropriate for the purposes of this RP, including magnetic testing to differentiate between ferritic and austenitic materials. It is

important that users define the objectives and accuracies required of the PMI tool they wish to apply. All of the tools have benefits and limitations on the elements that can be detected, in addition to the accuracy and ability to differentiate between different material grades that have only slight variations in alloying elements. (See Annex A.)

6.2 MVP Test Method Objectives

The test methods outlined in this document are intended to identify materials and are not intended to establish the exact conformance of a material to a particular specification. Depending on the test method selected, the method may only identify the nominal composition of materials. Identification of materials by visual stamps/markings alone should not be considered as a substitute for PMI but may be an important component of an overall quality assurance program.

6.3 PMI Procedure

The PMI procedure should identify and include:

- the techniques to be applied;
- equipment calibration;
- qualification requirements for personnel conducting the PMI;
- surface preparation requirements;
- testing methodology applied;
- acceptance criteria; and
- documentation requirements.

6.4 Personnel Qualifications

Person(s) performing PMI should be knowledgeable about all aspects of operation of the PMI equipment and the test method being applied. Qualifications of the person performing the test, including training and experience, should be submitted for review and approval by the owner/user.

The owner/user is responsible to assure that all individuals performing PMI are trained and qualified in accordance with the applicable procedure used during the examination. Certification and qualification are two of the most effective methods to prove requirements are met.

6.5 Chemical Analysis Techniques

6.5.1 Laboratory Chemical Analysis

Owner/user-approved material analysis laboratories using X-ray emission spectrometry, optical emission spectrometry, or wet chemical analysis can provide the most accurate analytical results for all elements. The accuracy is typically much higher than is normally needed for PMI. Laboratory analysis may involve the removal of significant amounts of material, and is typically slower than field PMI techniques.

6.5.2 Chemical Spot Testing

The chemical spot test is typically accomplished by electrochemically removing a minute amount of surface metal and depositing it onto moistened filter paper. Reagents dropped onto the paper produce distinct colors that are indicative of the presence of specific elements in the sample tested. Chemical spot testing is much slower than the other field PMI methods, and interpretation is subjective.

6.6 Sorting Analysis Techniques

6.6.1 Resistivity Testing

The principle employed in this test method is known as the Seebeck effect, or thermoelectric principle. A heated junction of dissimilar metal is created when the heated probe [300 °F (150 °C)] and the metal being tested are in contact with each other. The voltage generated at this junction is representative of the chemistry and crystalline structure of the metal being tested. Every alloy of a given crystalline structure will generate the same voltage regardless of the geometry or size of the piece being tested or the pressure applied. By references to known standards, these instruments are capable of sorting and identifying a wide range of ferrous and nonferrous materials. Alloy sorters have not proved to be consistently capable of sorting low-alloy (< 5 % Cr) and austenitic stainless steels.

6.6.2 Other Techniques

Techniques such as eddy-current sorting, electromagnetic alloy sorting, triboelectric testing (e.g. ferrite meters), and thermoelectric testing are qualitative and as such may only be appropriate for limited sorting applications and not for specific alloy identification.

6.7 Spectrometer Technology

6.7.1 Portable X-ray Fluorescence

There are several variants of portable X-ray fluorescence (XRF) spectrometers available. The principle of operation is that one or more gamma ray or X-ray sources are used to generate a beam of low-energy radiation to excite the material under analysis. The material under analysis then emits a characteristic radiation spectrum that can be analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively to determine which elements are present and in what quantity. The results of this analysis can be reported in either of the following formats:

- as a match against one of many reference spectra stored in the instrument (i.e. “316 Stainless Steel” or “5 Cr – $\frac{1}{2}$ Mo Steel”); and/or
- each element present reported as a percentage (i.e. “Iron = 87.5 %” or “Iron = 0.875” as part of an entire elemental list that should be normalized against 100 %).

A number of PMI instruments are available. These instruments can have the sensitivity to determine the elemental levels that meet the ASTM limits. Advancements in XRF technology, such as 50KV, X-ray tubes, and silica drift detectors (SDD), allow the user to detect light elements down to very low concentrations in steel substrates. For example, the latest generation of handheld X-ray fluorescence analyzers now measure light elements (Mg, Al, Si, P, and S) to very low limits of detection (see Annex A) and can provide for field measurement of silicon in steel down to very low concentrations.

These advancements in technology allow for accurate, nondestructive measurements to be conducted. However, to get this near-laboratory-quality measurement, significant care regarding surface preparation and cleanliness is required, as contamination of the prepared surface can lead to inaccurate results. Most assets are exposed to environments that promote surface corrosion and contamination, which can interfere with the analysis. Typically, a small test area is prepared with a portable grinding disk (60 to 80 grit, minimum zirconium aluminum oxide disposable abrasive disk) to properly clean the sample location prior to analysis.

The inherent limitations of the technique mean it is not possible to detect all elements. XRF analyzers are capable of detecting elements from magnesium (Mg) to Uranium (U) in the periodic tables. This excludes some of the important elements in carbon steels, such as carbon and boron. It is important to define exactly what elemental analysis is required and select an appropriate instrument.

6.7.2 Portable Optical Emission Spectrometry

In optical emission spectrometry (OES), an electric arc, spark, or laser stimulates atoms in the test sample to emit a characteristic spectrum of light for each element in the sample. The combined light spectra from different

elements are passed through a light guide to the optical analyzer. In the analyzer, the light is dispersed into its spectral components, and then measured and evaluated against stored calibration curves.

These devices fall into three groups:

- 1) The first is a lightweight, portable, and operator-evaluated device that can typically identify up to 16 elements but depends upon operator evaluation of the light spectra. These devices do not directly indicate alloy grade or composition, but produce an output in the form of visible light spectra that permits semi-qualitative alloy identification. This technique is highly sensitive to operator skill and experience.
- 2) The second group refers to field-portable, laboratory grade analyzers. These were originally difficult to use due to their size and weight; however, modern units are now available that can be considered lightweight, including the small argon cylinders required for operation. Some of these analyzers operate in a pure arc mode for routine PMI applications, while the more sophisticated units have a spark mode allowing laboratory quality analysis. The significant advantage of these instruments is the expansion of elements that can be analyzed, including carbon. Another advantage of these advanced instruments is that they are not subject to operator interpretation.

Similar to X-ray fluorescence devices, results can be reported in either a spectral match or elemental percentage mode. As these techniques generate arcs and sparks, a potential ignition source occurs during their operation; therefore, prior to use of this technique in the field, a review shall be conducted in order to determine if gas testing and hot work permits are required.

- 3) The third group is known as laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS), in which an atomic emission spectroscopy technique uses highly energetic laser pulses. The laser is focused to form plasma, which atomizes and excites samples. Plasma light emissions provide the spectral signature of chemical composition for practically any material.

When calibrated for metal analysis, LIBS can provide both qualitative and quantitative information to determine which elements are present and in what quantity.

Considerable progress has been made during the past few years in LIBS technology. Handheld LIBS metal analyzers are becoming available that can provide fast in situ chemical analysis with appropriate precision and detection limits (Annex A). The significant advantage of LIBS technology is its wide element range. In principle, LIBS can detect all elements, limited by the power of the laser as well as the sensitivity and wavelength range of the spectrograph and detector. The LIBS technology also can provide low-level carbon analysis, which, in principle, enables LIBS to positively identify a wide range of ferrous alloys.

This technique generates a laser during operation, which is a potential ignition source. Therefore, before using this technique in the field, a review shall be conducted in order to determine if gas testing and hot work permits are required.

6.7.3 Equipment Calibration

Persons performing PMI should calibrate and/or verify the test equipment performance as specified by the equipment manufacturer. The PMI procedure should provide the frequency interval for this calibration/verification. If calibration procedures are not provided by the equipment manufacturer, they should be established by the owner/user. Typically, these procedures should include calibration/verification using certified standards. The owner/user may consider requirement of equipment verification checks on a routine (e.g. once per shift) using certified standards of the same alloy family.

6.7.4 Equipment Precision

The precision of the test equipment should be consistent with the established test objectives (see 5.2). When elemental composition is desired, the owner/user should establish the acceptable precision and repeatability.

Accuracy and the method in which it is determined need to be understood (reference Annex A). For example, in some tools the sensitivity may depend on duration of the test in order to improve signal averaging algorithms. Failure to understand these issues may produce inaccurate results.

6.8 Safety Issues

6.8.1 General

The specific requirements for each PMI technique should be clearly reviewed as to the amount of mechanical preparation. Consideration should be given to the anticipated thickness of the sample before mechanical methods are used to prepare the sample. In addition, considerations for electrical arcing and “hot spots” should be considered, as well as appropriate electrical and hot work permits. Chemical spot testing involves the use of a variety of chemicals. Appropriate safety precautions should be taken when handling these chemicals.

6.8.2 XRF Analyzers

6.8.2.1 Intrinsic Safety

XRF analyzers *are not* intrinsically safe. Pertinent hot-work procedures should be followed in areas where non-intrinsically-safe equipment is to be used.

6.8.2.2 Radiation Safety

The user should be aware of potential radiation exposure hazards when operating an XRF device. The user is expected to observe local jurisdictional requirements that govern radiation safety, and consult the manufacturer’s instructions for safe operation.

6.8.3 PMI of Welding Consumables

Performing PMI of a weld cap does not assure the root pass or subsequent weld passes are made with the specified chemistry. An acceptable method to address in-process PMI during welding is explained here:

- Prior to use in fabrication, sample “buttons” should be welded using each heat of bare wire, lot of covered electrodes, or flux-cored electrodes. PMI can then be used to confirm that weld metal meets specification. The size of the weld button should be adequate to assure accurate test results.
- Some weld rods have the alloying elements contained in the flux, and do not meet the alloy specification until welded.
- It is not necessary to test a button of bare wire if the test chosen can identify the composition of the wire before welding.

6.8.3.1 Longitudinal Pipe and Fitting Welds

Where there is reason to suspect problems, longitudinally welded alloy pipe and fittings should receive PMI verification of the base metal and weld metal.

6.8.3.2 Autogenous Welds

If the owner/user determines that material verification testing is required on autogenous-welded (with no added filler metal) alloy pipe or fittings, it is necessary to conduct testing on only the base metal. If repairs are made during original fabrication, the fabricator is to conduct testing on the base metal and the weld metal if a filler metal was used for the repair.

6.8.3.3 Dissimilar Metal Welds and Weld Overlays

Results from testing dissimilar metal welds should take into account the effects of dilution, which occurs during weld deposition. The owner/user should establish the minimum compositional requirements of the as-deposited weld metal necessary for the intended service.

7 Evaluation of Testing Results

7.1 Material Acceptance Methods

The owner/user may elect any one of the following methods of material acceptance.

- a) Materials can be confirmed to contain the nominal amounts of alloying elements specified in the relevant materials specification (e.g. ASME Section II or ASTM specifications).
- b) Materials can be classified through a qualitative sorting technique (see 6.7) to establish the conformance with the intended material.
- c) When PMI indicates that alloying elements are outside the ranges indicated in the material specification, the owner/user may still choose to allow the use of the tested materials in situations where a person knowledgeable of the appropriate damage mechanisms confirms that the material will perform satisfactorily in the service.
- d) If testing using one of the portable or qualitative analysis methods leads to the potential rejection of a component, a more accurate analysis may be used to determine component acceptance (see Section 6).

7.2 Follow-up PMI after Discovery of a Nonconformity

If any one of a representative sample is rejected, all items of that inspection lot should be considered suspect. A more extensive inspection of the remaining lot should be considered.

8 Materials Identification

8.1 Identification Process

Alloy materials should be identified by their alloy designation or nominal composition. Examples of some acceptable identification methods are:

- a) color coding by alloy;
- b) a low-stress stamp marking indicating that the test has been performed;
- c) documentation showing both the PMI results and the PMI locations.

Test locations should be shown on appropriate drawings so that each test site can be traceable to the fabricated components.

8.2 Color Coding/Marking

8.2.1 If the material verification program procedure established by the owner/user requires a visual identification such as color coding or marking, the owner/user should maintain a record of the alloy material/color code combinations. PFI Standard *ES22* is an example of one such system. Materials identification by color coding is not a substitute for permanent manufacturers' markings required by applicable ASTM or other materials specifications.

8.2.2 Where reliance on color marking is used, persons responsible for reading the colors should be confirmed as being able to distinguish the difference between the colors being used.

8.3 Marking of Components

If the owner/user's documentation process requires physical marking of equipment components, it should specify one of the following:

- whether or not the marking system should remain legible for the expected life of the component without deterioration due to corrosion or elevated temperature;
- whether or not the marking system is only temporary to facilitate proper handling and identification from the point of PMI to final installation. This marking can be semi-permanent paint applied to each item. The markers should not contain additives such as metallic pigments (Al, Pb, or Zn), sulfur, or chlorides.

9 Documentation and Recordkeeping

9.1 Shop and Field PMI Documentation

Those individuals performing PMI should obtain and follow the PMI procedure approved by the owner/user. This procedure should include the technique used, equipment calibration, the qualification requirements of PMI personnel, the testing methodology, and documentation requirements.

When documentation, such as drawings, is used in lieu of physical marking, the documentation should allow the owner/user to identify which components were tested.

9.2 New and Existing Equipment or System Documentation

When PMI is conducted on new or existing assets and systems, records of the results should be kept as long as the equipment exists in its original location. If equipment or a portion of an equipment system that has not received material verification is relocated, the owner/user should consider the need for PMI prior to placing the relocated components into service.

Where applicable, some owner/users have created master PMI piping isometric drawings to track the components that were tested and test results. These drawings are maintained and updated as piping modifications occur from projects or process changes. A single documentation system eliminates the need to search for data in multiple locations.

9.3 PMI Records

Typical PMI records should contain the following:

- reference to the PMI procedure(s) used;
- date of testing;
- test instrument identification number or serial number, where appropriate;
- name of each person performing the tests, with identification of their respective employer;
- results of the tests;
- basis and action for resolving and documenting PMI nonconformances, including those that have been left in service;
- documentation of the criteria used for prioritization of equipment or systems and extent of PMI performed.

The information listed should be reported in such a manner that it is traceable to the point of installation.

Alternatively, the owner/user may choose to include this within the written material verification procedure. When included in the owner/user's written material verification procedure, the date and edition number of the written procedure should be documented in the test record.

Annex A

(informative)

Statistical Terminology

Below are some of the terms regarding statistics that may be encountered when using the methodology and/or technology discussed within this document.

- Accuracy: The closeness of agreement between the test result and the accepted reference value.
- Precision: The closeness of agreement between independent test results. The precision depends only on the distribution of random errors and does not relate to the accepted standard certified value.
- Bias: The difference between the expectation of the test results and an accepted reference value. Bias is a systematic error, in contrast to a random error. There may be one or more systematic error components contributing to the bias.
- Limit of detection (LOD): The lowest concentration of analyte that can be reliably distinguished from zero concentration in a sample by defining a 99 % confidence to show that the analyte concentration is greater than zero. Therefore, 3-sigma calculations must be used to determine LOD (see definition for standard deviation (SD) below).
- Instrument detection limit (IDL): The lowest (best) detection limit generated by an instrument in a clean matrix (blank).
- Method detection limit (MDL): The typical detection limit obtained when running a typical sample. It is matrix dependent, and will vary from matrix to matrix.
- Limit of quantitation (LOQ): The lowest concentration that can be reliably measured to allow quantitative readings. It is typically defined as 10-sigma (or 3.33 times the LOD).
- Standard deviation (SD): The standard deviation is a statistic that defines how tightly all the data is clustered around the mean in a dataset. It essentially measures the variability (spread or dispersion) from the mean (average) and is defined mathematically. For “normal” distributions, we can apply an empirical rule that states that 68 % of the data is within one standard deviation of the mean; 95 % of the data is within two standard deviations of the mean; and 99.7 % of the data is within three standard deviations of the mean.
- Relative standard deviation (RSD): The standard deviation is divided by the mean of the data and multiplied by 100 to give a % value. The bigger the % value, the “noisier” the signal and less confidence in the final value.
- Repeatability: The duplicate (or more) analysis within the shortest possible time, performed by the same person using the same method. The standard of many analyses using repeatability conditions indicates the minimum deviation achievable in the particular conditions.
- Reproducibility: This is a duplicate (or more) analysis performed by a different person, preferably using a different method or (different instrument).

Bibliography

The following documents may reference this recommended practice, and have been used during its development.

- [1] API 510, *Pressure Vessel Inspection Code: Maintenance Inspection, Rating, Repair, and Alteration*
- [2] API Standard 560, *Fired Heaters for General Refinery Services*
- [3] API 570, *Piping Inspection Code: In-service Inspection, Repair, and Alteration of Piping Systems*
- [4] API Recommended Practice 571, *Damage Mechanisms Affecting Fixed Equipment In the Refining Industry*
- [5] API Recommended Practice 572, *Inspection of Pressure Vessels*
- [6] API Recommended Practice 573, *Inspection of Fired Boilers and Heaters*
- [7] API Recommended Practice 574, *Inspection Practices for Piping System Components*
- [8] API Recommended Practice 575, *Inspection of Existing Atmospheric and Low-pressure Storage Tanks*
- [9] API Recommended Practice 576, *Inspection of Pressure-Relieving Devices*
- [10] API Recommended Practice 577, *Welding Inspection and Metallurgy*
- [11] API 579-1/ASME FFS-1, *Fitness-For-Service*
- [12] API Recommended Practice 580, *Risk-Based Inspection*
- [13] API Recommended Practice 583, *Corrosion Under Insulation and Fireproofing*
- [14] API Recommended Practice 751, *Safe Operation of Hydrofluoric Acid Alkylation Units*
- [15] API RP 939-C, *Guidelines for Avoiding Sulfidation (Sulfidic) Corrosion Failures in Oil Refineries*
- [16] ASME ¹ B31.3, *Process Piping*
- [17] ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code: Section II Materials (Part A: Ferrous Material Specifications, Part B: Nonferrous Material Specifications, Part C: Specifications for Welding Rods, Electrodes, and Filler Metals, Part D: Properties – Materials)
- [18] ASME PCC-2, *Repair of Pressure Equipment and Piping*
- [19] ASTM ² E1476-97, *Standard Guide for Metals Identification, Grade Verification, and Sorting*
- [20] Center for Chemical Process Safety ³, *Guidelines for Mechanical Integrity Systems*, Appendix 7C.

¹ ASME International, 3 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10016, www.asme.org.

² ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania 19428, www.astm.org.

³ Center for Chemical Process Safety, 120 Wall Street, Floor 23, New York, New York 10005, www.aiche.org/ccps.

-
- [21] CSB ⁴ Bulletin 2005-04-B, "Positive Material Verification: Prevent Errors During Alloy Steel Systems Maintenance"
 - [22] NACE ⁵ International, Paper No. 03651, "Specification for Carbon Steel Materials for Hydrofluoric Acid Alkylation Units"
 - [23] Process Industry Practices ⁶, "Positive Material Identification Specification," VESPMI01, April 2011.
 - [24] PFI ⁷ Standard ES22, *Recommended Practice for Color Coding of Piping Materials*

⁴ Chemical Safety Board, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 910, Washington, DC 20006, www.csb.gov.

⁵ National Association of Corrosion Engineers, 15835 Park Ten Place, Houston, Texas 77084, www.nace.org.

⁶ Process Industry Practices, 3925 West Braker Lane (R4500), Austin, Texas 78759, www.pip.org.

⁷ Pipe Fabrication Institute, 511 Avenue of the Americas, #601, New York, New York 10011. www.pfi-institute.org.