

# 1992 NBIC Interpretations

## INTERPRETATION 94-2

**Subject:** Chapter III, Paragraph R-301.1,  
1992 edition

Question: Is it a requirement of the Code the inspector give prior approval for a repair of a routine nature?

Reply: Yes (Chapter III, R-301.1, page 33).

## INTERPRETATION 94-1

**Subject:** Chapter III,  
1989 edition

Question: For repair of valves, other than safety, safety relief and relief valves, covered and required by B31.1 as part of the boiler external piping, is it a requirement of the NBIC that an organization repairing such valves have a valid "R" Certificate of Authorization?

Reply: No.

## INTERPRETATION 93-6

**Subject:** Chapter III, Re-rating,  
1992 edition

Question: Do the rules of the NBIC permit the re-rating of a completed boiler or pressure vessel to a higher MAWP by performing radiography and recalculating the pressure using a higher joint efficiency?

Reply: No.

## INTERPRETATION 93-5

**Subject:** Chapter III, R-503(d),  
1992 edition

Question: If a pressure test required for a re-rated vessel is less than or equal to the hydrostatic test performed during construction, is a new pressure test required after the re-rating is completed?

Reply: No, provided no physical work is performed.

## INTERPRETATION 93-4

**Subject:** Chapter III, R-301.2 Acceptance of Repairs and Alterations,  
1992 edition

Question: May an Owner-User Commissioned Inspector perform acceptance inspections and sign an R-1 Form for alterations performed by the Owner-User Inspector's employer when the employer holds a valid "R" Certificate of Authorization?

Reply: No.

### **INTERPRETATION 93-2**

**Subject:** 1992 Edition

Question 1: May a fillet welded patch plate be installed as an alteration?

Reply 1: No.

Question 2: May a reinforced opening through the shell be added to a pressure vessel as an alteration?

Reply 2: Yes, provided the reinforcing pad meets all the applicable requirements of Section VIII, Division 1 of the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code, including the provision of weep holes in the reinforcing pad.

### **INTERPRETATION 93-1**

**Subject:** 1992 Edition

Question: Is it a requirement of the Code that the inspector who performs the acceptance inspection and certifies the R-1 Form be the same inspector who authorized the initiation of the repair or alteration?

Reply: No. However, the inspector who performs the acceptance inspection and certifies the R-1 Form must be employed by the same Authorized Inspection Agency as the inspector who authorized the repair or alteration.

### **INTERPRETATION 92-7**

**Subject:** 1992 Edition

Question: When an alteration/re-rating is performed where one organization performs the required design calculation and a second organization performs the necessary physical work, how may alteration/re-rating be performed by the two organizations?

Reply: It is the intent of the NBIC that the certification of the alteration/re-rating performed by the two organizations may be accomplished in accordance with the following procedure:

1. The "R" Certificate Holder performing the design function shall complete an R-1 Form certifying the design change. The following statement shall be included under remarks on the R-1 form: Design Only.
2. The "R" Certificate Holder performing the field activities, including the pressure testing and stamping, shall complete a second R-1 Form certifying the field activities. The "R" Certificate Holder performing the field activities shall be responsible for collecting and distributing all data report forms.

#### **INTERPRETATION 92-6**

**Subject:** 1992 Edition

Question: When a jurisdiction adopts the NBIC, does the jurisdiction adopt any other jurisdiction's authorization for an out-of-state organization to perform repairs?

Reply: No.

#### **INTERPRETATION 92-5**

**Subject:** 1992 Edition

Question: In some instances, the NBIC provides alternative requirements that may be applied when accepted by the jurisdiction. How may alternative requirements be applied at an installation located in an area where there is no jurisdiction?

Reply: It is the intent of the NBIC that where there is no jurisdiction, alternative requirements may be accepted by the Authorized Inspection Agency responsible for signing the R-1 form.

#### **INTERPRETATION 92-4**

**Subject:** 1992 Edition

Question: Is it the intent of Chapter III, Supplement 1 that boiler or pressure vessel tube replacement using tubes of an equal or greater allowable stress value be considered a repair when the replacement material satisfies the original ASME Code requirements and such replacement has been accepted by an ASME Code stamp holder or a registered professional engineer?

Reply: No. However, a revision to the 1989 Edition of the NBIC, published in the January 1990 BULLETIN, revised these requirements.