

# REPORT No 11291-AMD1

*Date of issue: October 24, 2025*

*Status: FINAL REPORT*

\*\*\*\*\*

## NACE TM 0284

## EVALUATION OF PIPELINE AND PRESSURE VESSEL STEELS FOR RESISTANCE TO HYDROGEN-INDUCED CRACKING

### Program: SQO-M4 Round 17

\*\*\*\*\*

Report history			
Report:	Modification:	Chapter:	Date:
11291	-	-	August 15, 2025
11291-AMD1	Batch number and homogeneity result correction	5	October 24, 2025

This document is issued by the Company subject to its Terms and Conditions, available on request or accessible at <https://www.ptsouthquality.com/terms-and-conditions>. The Company's sole responsibility is to its Client and this document does not exonerate parties to a transaction from exercising all their rights and obligations under transaction documents. This document cannot be reproduced except in full, without prior written approval of the Company. Any unauthorized alteration, forgery or falsification of the content or appearance of this document is unlawful and offenders may be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Copyright © 2024 South Quality, Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA



Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Approved by:
<b>Sergio Andrada</b> Assistant Technician	<b>Eng. Alfredo Schmidt</b> Metallurgical expert	<b>Eng. Emiliano Medina</b> Quality Assurance Lead

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. FOREWORD</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. HOMOGENEITY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6. SAMPLE INFORMATION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7. IMAGES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>8. ASSIGNED VALUES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>9. PARTICIPANTS' RESULTS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>10. STATISTICS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>11. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>12. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>11</b>
 <b>APPENDIX</b>	
 <b>A1 - PARTICIPANT DATA</b>	 <b>12</b>
 <b>A2 - PARTICIPANT RESULTS</b>	 <b>12</b>
 <b>APPENDIX B</b>	 <b>18</b>

## 1. FOREWORD

This report summarizes the results of the **SQO-M4 (Round 17)** proficiency testing program on the evaluation of the resistance of pressure vessel plate steels to HIC caused by hydrogen absorption from aqueous sulfide corrosion. This program is carried out under a simultaneous participation format, according to the A.3.1 classification of the ISO 17043 standard ("Model 2 - Figure A.1").

**South Quality** conducted the testing program between June and August 2025. The aim of the program was to assess laboratory ability to competently perform the nominated tests.

## 2. ORGANIZATION

Program Coordinator:	Eng. Alfredo Schmidt
Assistant Technician:	Sergio Andrada
Statistic:	Lic. Manuel Tozaki
Supervision:	Eng. Emiliano Medina

## 3. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this proficiency testing program is to evaluate the resistance of pressure vessel plate steels to HIC caused by hydrogen absorption from aqueous sulfide corrosion, using the following standard:

Standard
ANSI/NACE TM0284: 2016

Batches of steels samples have been selected.

Participants in this program have not been previously informed of the values or the expected range of values for the samples they will receive.

#### 4. PARTICIPANTS

In the present round, 22 laboratories have participated with the following details:

CODE	Country	ISO 17025 Accredited	Results delivered
01	Brazil	Yes	Yes
02	Malaysia	Yes	Yes
03	France	Yes	No
04	Spain	No	Yes
05	Peru	No	Yes
06	Brazil	Yes	Yes
07	Spain	Yes	No
08	Portugal	Yes	Yes
09	Spain	Yes	Yes
10	Pakistan	No	Yes
11	Italy	Yes	Yes
12	Mexico	Yes	Yes
13	Türkiye	Yes	Yes
14	Argentina	Yes	No
15	Colombia	Yes	Yes
16	Australia	Yes	Yes
17	Germany	Yes	Yes
18	England	Yes	Yes
19	Romania	Yes	Yes
20	Hong Kong	Yes	No
21	Germany	Yes	Yes
22	France	No	Yes

## 5. HOMOGENEITY

Several batches were prepared identically by South Quality staff.

Subsequently, a homogeneity study was conducted with an ISO 17025 accredited laboratory.

The control process followed ISO Guide 35: 2017, clause 7.4.1.2. Stratified random sampling was employed, and samples were chosen using random number generation software.

The results of these tests are presented below:

Size of each batch: **150 samples**

Tested samples from each batch: **30 samples**

DETERMINATION (SOLUTION A)	HOMOGENEITY OF RESULTS IN THE ANALYZED SAMPLES - LOW CARBON STEEL -		
	BATCH: LM3419	BATCH: LM3420	BATCH: LM3421
CSR	YES	YES	YES
CLR	YES	YES	YES
CTR	YES	YES	YES

Size of each batch: **150 samples**

Tested samples from each batch: **30 samples**

DETERMINATION (SOLUTION B)	HOMOGENEITY OF RESULTS IN THE ANALYZED SAMPLES - STAINLESS STEEL -		
	BATCH: LM3527	BATCH: LM3528	BATCH: LM3529
CSR	NO	YES	YES
CLR	NO	YES	YES
CTR	NO	YES	YES

Samples for this program are taken from selected batches identified as **LM3421** and **LM3528**.

Analysis of this testing data indicated that samples were sufficiently homogeneous for the program and, therefore, any participant results identified as outliers cannot be attributed to sample variability.

## 6. SAMPLE INFORMATION

The following samples were sent for testing (Participant **Code 19**):

Batch:	LM3421
Sample ID:	32 + 80 + 147
Characteristics:	Carbon steel (SAE 1010) - 100 x 19.1 x 9.5 mm

Batch:	LM3528
Sample ID:	24 + 82 + 139
Characteristics:	Stainless steel (AISI 304) - 100 x 19.1 x 9.5 mm

## 7. IMAGES



## 8. ASSIGNED VALUES

The assigned values are obtained from the results reported by all participants (**Consensus values**).

## 9. PARTICIPANTS' RESULTS

LABORATORY CODE	LM3421			LM3528		
	MEAN			MEAN		
	CSR	CLR	CTR	CSR	CLR	CTR
01	0.250	2.591	5.448	0	0	0
02	0.117	4.247	3.516	0	0	0
04	1.131	4.112	3.275	0	0	0
05	1.389	2.335	9.523	0	0	0
06	0.336	4.001	5.207	0	0	0
08	1.445	2.014	3.161	0	0	0
09	0.659	2.591	2.866	0	0	0
10	0.781	5.953	2.636	0	0	0
11	0.488	2.719	2.225	0	0	0
12	0.913	6.859	3.123	0	0.05	0.04
13	1.051	2.847	2.495	0	0	0
15	1.378	4.045	3.874	0	0	0
16	1.168	1.472	2.886	0	0	0
17	1.680	4.600	6.220	0	0.03	0.09
18	1.304	1.640	5.442	0	0	0
19	0.398	0.654	0.007	0	0	0
21	0.420	4.470	6.950	0	0	0
22	1.472	1.632	4.915	0	0	0

ASSIGNED VALUES				
PARAMETER	LM3421		LM3528	
	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
CSR	0.910	0.490	0	-
CLR	3.054	1.407	0	-
CTR	4.098	2.148	0	-

## 10. STATISTICS

The results must be treated as qualitative as quantitative.

According B.3.1.3 of ISO 17043 the appropriate technique is to compare participant results with the assigned values.

- a) For qualitative results (Values equal to zero), the comparison will be made directly against the assigned value, and any difference will be evaluated as **Unsatisfactory**.
- b) For quantitative results the comparison will be made through  $z$  **score** (B3 - ISO 17043).

$$z = \frac{x - X}{\hat{\sigma}}$$

$x$  is the participant's result

$X$  is the assigned value

$\hat{\sigma}$  is the standard deviation

The performance evaluation of each sample is carried out with the following criteria:

$|z| \leq 2.0$  indicates "satisfactory" performance and generates no signal;

$2.0 < |z| < 3.0$  indicates "questionable" performance and generates a warning signal;

$|z| \geq 3.0$  indicates "unsatisfactory" performance and generates an action signal;

## 11. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

LABORATORY CODE	z score   - BATCH: LM3421		
	CSR	CLR	CTR
01	1.35	0.33	0.63
02	1.62	0.85	0.27
04	0.45	0.75	0.38
05	0.98	0.51	<b>2.53</b>
06	1.17	0.67	0.52
08	1.09	0.74	0.44
09	0.51	0.33	0.57
10	0.26	<b>2.06</b>	0.68
11	0.86	0.24	0.87
12	0.20	<b>3.36</b>	0.26
13	0.29	0.15	0.75
15	0.96	0.70	0.10
16	0.53	1.12	0.56
17	1.88	1.55	1.41
18	0.80	1.00	0.63
19	0.92	1.59	1.95
21	0.88	1.45	1.80
22	1.15	1.01	0.38

Laboratory **Code 01**: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory **Code 02**: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 03: The laboratory has not sent the results before the deadline.

Laboratory Code 04: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 05: The laboratory obtained **QUESTIONABLE** results for the CTR parameter determination in the sample from batch LM3421. However, **SATISFACTORY** results were achieved for all other parameters in both samples.

Laboratory Code 06: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 07: The laboratory has not sent the results before the deadline.

Laboratory Code 08: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 09: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 10: The laboratory obtained **QUESTIONABLE** results for the CLR parameter determination in the sample from batch LM3421. However, **SATISFACTORY** results were achieved for all other parameters in both samples.

Laboratory Code 11: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 12: The laboratory obtained **UNSATISFACTORY** results for the CLR parameter determination in the sample from batch LM3421 and for the CLR and CTR parameters in the sample from batch LM3528. However, **SATISFACTORY** results were achieved for all other parameters in both samples.

Laboratory Code 13: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 14: The laboratory has not sent the results before the deadline.

Laboratory Code 15: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 16: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 17: The laboratory obtained **UNSATISFACTORY** results for the CLR and CTR parameters in the sample from batch LM3528. However, **SATISFACTORY** results were achieved for all other parameters in both samples.

Laboratory Code 18: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 19: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 20: The laboratory has not sent the results before the deadline.

Laboratory Code 21: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

Laboratory Code 22: The laboratory obtained **SATISFACTORY** results for the determination of all assigned values in both samples.

## 12. CONCLUSIONS

The overall performance of participating laboratories in the **SQO-M4 (Round 17)** program, based on expected results, is summarized as follows:

- Laboratories Codes **01, 02, 04, 06, 08, 09, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21**, and **22** have obtained a **SUFFICIENT** performance according to the expected results and should not take any action;
- Laboratories Codes **05**, and **10** has obtained an **ALMOST SUFFICIENT** performance according to the expected results and must evaluate whether it is necessary to take action on the tests where they obtained a different result than expected;
- Laboratory Code **12**, and **17** has obtained an **INSUFFICIENT** performance according to the expected results and must take action on the tests where they obtained a different result than expected (See Appendix B).

The criteria used for evaluating overall performance are as follows:


- **SUFFICIENT** performance: No unsatisfactory or questionable results were obtained.
- **ALMOST SUFFICIENT** performance: No unsatisfactory results were obtained, but one questionable result was found.
- **INSUFFICIENT** performance: One unsatisfactory result or two questionable results were obtained.


## APPENDIX A

### A1 - PARTICIPANT DATA

Company: **METALLURGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE**  
Laboratory: **ANALYSIS AND TESTING LABORATORY**  
Country: Romania  
Client ID: E468  
Contact person: Marian Bratu - General Manager  
[icem.bucuresti@yahoo.com](mailto:icem.bucuresti@yahoo.com)

### A2 - PARTICIPANT RESULTS



	
<b>INSTRUCTIONS &amp; RESULTS FORM</b>	
<b>PROGRAM:</b>	Evaluation of pipeline and pressure vessel steels for resistance to hydrogen-induced cracking
<b>CODE:</b>	SQO-M4
<b>ROUND:</b>	17
<b>STANDARD:</b>	NACE TM 0284
<b>COORDINATOR:</b>	Eng. Alfredo Schmidt ( <a href="mailto:aschmidt@ptsouthquality.com">aschmidt@ptsouthquality.com</a> )
DSQ-012 - REV 04 -	SQO-M4 R17 May 2025 1 of 6

## 1 - General

This document is intended to be filled with the results of the **SQO-M4** program (Round 17).

Results must be typed, not handwritten.

## 2 - Standard

**ANSI/NACE TM0284: 2016**

## 3 - Participant

<b>METALLURGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE</b> ANALYSIS AND TESTING LABORATORY	<b>CODE 19</b>
--	----------------

## 4 - Tests involved

TEST
Evaluation of the resistance of pressure vessel plate steels to HIC caused by hydrogen absorption from aqueous sulfide corrosion

## 5 - Samples

CODE	SAMPLE	QUANTITY
LM3421-XX	Steel - 100 x 19.1 x 9.5 mm	3
LM3528-XX	Steel - 100 x 19.1 x 9.5 mm	3

## 6 - Notes

- The deadline for the delivery of results is **July 21, 2025**.
- Tables in this document may be modified to include additional data or observations.
- Samples must be retained until the end of the program, which concludes with the submission of the final report.
- Participants may improve the surface to ensure a better testing area. If so, the procedure must be described in the observations box.
- Samples **LM3421** are to be tested using **solution A**.
- Samples **LM3528** are to be tested using **solution B**.
- The sample should be treated as a routine laboratory specimen. All testing, recording, and reporting must be carried out in accordance with ANSI/NACE TM0284.
- To support the review of results, submission of test images is appreciated. Images may be attached at the end of this document or sent via email.
- Once the document is completed, please convert it to a PDF file and send it to the program coordinator.

## 7 - Test results

Test date:	30.06.2025 – 04.07.2025	Solution:	<b>A</b>
Sample preparation:	Grinding <input type="checkbox"/>	Test duration:	96 h
	Sawing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	pH at start of test:	2,62
	Machining <input type="checkbox"/>	pH at end of test:	3,75
Polished grade:	Up to mirror brightness	Solution temperature:	27,5 C deg
Method of testing of adequacy degreasing:	With acetone until proper degreasing according to ASTM F21	H <sub>2</sub> S concentration (mg/L):	2505
		Purged inert gas:	Argon

SAMPLE	DIMENSIONS (mm)		
	LENGTH	WIDE	THICKNESS
<b>LM3421-32</b>	107,42	19,01	9,17
<b>LM3421-80</b>	105,98	19,06	9,26
<b>LM3421-147</b>	105,25	19,13	9,21

SAMPLE	SECTION	RESULTS (%)		
		CSR	CLR	CTR
<b>LM3421-32</b>	I	0.4734	0.8724	0.0041
	II	1.6833	2.3991	0.0404
	III	1.4203	2.6172	0.0189
<b>LM3421-80</b>	I	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	II	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	III	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>LM3421-147</b>	I	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	II	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	III	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>MEAN</b>		0.3975	0.6543	0.0070







OBSERVATIONS
<p>Alumina (Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) suspension of 0,3 µm was used to prepare by polishing the samples surfaces up to mirror brightness before optical microscope investigation. The samples tested in NACE solution A before microstructure analysis were etched with Nital solution (5 ml HNO<sub>3</sub> : 95 ml etanol) for 15 seconds.</p>









Test date:	30.06.2025 – 04.07.2025	Solution:	<b>B</b>
Sample preparation:	Grinding <input type="checkbox"/>	Test duration:	96 h
	Sawing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	pH at start of test:	8,17
	Machining <input type="checkbox"/>	pH at end of test:	5,23
Polished grade:	Up to mirror brightness	Solution temperature:	27 C deg
Method of testing of adequacy degreasing:	With acetone until proper degreasing according to ASTM F21	H <sub>2</sub> S concentration (mg/L):	2403
		Purged inert gas:	Argon

SAMPLE	DIMENSIONS (mm)		
	LENGTH	WIDE	THICKNESS
<b>LM3528-24</b>	100,91	18,84	9,55
<b>LM3528-82</b>	100,08	18,80	9,56
<b>LM3528-139</b>	99,57	18,78	9,56

SAMPLE	SECTION	RESULTS (%)		
		CSR	CLR	CTR
<b>LM3528-24</b>	I	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	II	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	III	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>LM3528-82</b>	I	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	II	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	III	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>LM3528-139</b>	I	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	II	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
	III	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>MEAN</b>		<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>	<b>0.0000</b>

OBSERVATIONS
<p>The initial pH of the NACE B solution was 8.17. After the saturation in H<sub>2</sub>S the pH was 5.12 and at the ending of test was 5.23.</p> <p>Alumina (Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) suspension of 0,3 µm was used to prepare by polishing the samples surfaces up to mirror brightness before optical microscope investigation.</p> <p>The samples tested in NACE solution B before microstructure analysis were etched with aqua regia, namely solution of HCl :HNO<sub>3</sub> : (3:1) diluted in 1:1 with distilled water during 5 minute at the room temperature.</p>

PHOTOGRAPHS	
<b>Solution A</b>	<b>Solution B</b>
LM3421- 32// 80 // 147	LM3428 - 24 // 82 // 139
Surface pattern after NACE TM 0284 test	Surface pattern after NACE TM 0284 test
	
LM3421-32	LM3428-24
Microstructure of sample 32 Magnification x 100	Microstructure of sample 24 Magnification x 50
	
Microstructure of sample 32 Magnification x 200	Microstructure of sample 24 Magnification x 100
	

LM3421- 80	LM3428-82
Microstructure of sample 80 Magnification x 50	Microstructure of sample 82 Magnification x 50
	
Microstructure of sample 80 Magnification x 100	Microstructure of sample 82 Magnification x 100
	
LM3421-147	LM3428-139
Microstructure of sample 147 Magnification x 50	Microstructure of sample 139 Magnification x 50
	
Microstructure of sample 147 Magnification x 100	Microstructure of sample 139 Magnification x 100
	

# **APPENDIX B**

**VOID**

**----- END OF REPORT -----**