

1998 NBIC Interpretations

INTERPRETATION 98-44

Subject: RC-1093, Welder Performance Qualification Using SWPS
1995 Edition with the 1997 Addenda

Question: When not prohibited by the original code of construction, may a welder-performance qualification test be conducted in accordance with the standard welding procedure selected to do the repair?

Reply: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-43

Subject: Foreword, Appendix 4, Appendix 5
1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question Two pressure vessels are constructed and individually stamped with the
1: ASME Code “U” stamp. May the connection of the two vessels by a single circumferential weld be performed in accordance with the NBIC?

Reply 1: Yes.

Question Are changes in the dimensions of a pressure vessel beyond that described on
2: the data report considered an alteration?

Reply 2: Yes, if the changes affect the pressure containing capability of the pressure vessel. See Appendix 4, Glossary of Terms and Appendix 6.C, Examples of Alterations.

INTERPRETATION 98-42

Subject: RC-2031, RD-2030(d) Weld Buildup of Boiler Tubes? Wasted Areas
1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question: May weld buildup of wasted areas on boiler tubes addressed by RD-2030(d) be considered a routine repair in accordance with RC-2031(a)(1)?

Reply: Yes, provided all requirements of RC-2031 are met.

INTERPRETATION 98-41

Subject: RA-2330(g)
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question: May a holder of an ASME Certificate of Accreditation use documentation of the ASME survey to demonstrate compliance with Part RA-2330(g) of the NBIC?

Reply: No. RA-2330(g) provides the alternative to demonstration for an ASME ?N? type Certificate of Authorization.

INTERPRETATION 98-40

Subject: RD-2070 Stays
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question: Is the replacement of a threaded stay with a welded stay always classified as a repair?

Reply: No. In some cases, the design of threaded stays and welded stays will differ, which may change the MAWP. In such cases, the work shall be performed as an alteration.

INTERPRETATION 98-39

Subject: R-1 and R-2 Forms
1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question: A pressure-retaining item is repaired or altered in accordance with the NBIC. The pressure-retaining item and its Manufacturer's Data Report are not registered with the National Board. Is it required that the Inspector list his/her National Board Commission Number (including endorsements) in the "Certificate of Design Change Review" and "Certificate of Inspection" blocks of the appropriate Form R-1 and R-2?

Reply: Yes. See Appendix 5, instruction 28 in the Guide for Completing National Board R Forms.

INTERPRETATION 98-38

Subject: RC-3031(c) NDE in lieu of Pressure Testing
1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question: Would the desire to save time and/or expense constitute pressure testing as not being practicable?

Reply: No. The determination of "practicable?" is based on technical consideration of "the nature and scope of the alteration activity."

INTERPRETATION 98-37

Subject: RC-1050(a) Material Requirements
1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question: If a repair or alteration requires the use of material in accordance with RC-1050(a), are material test reports that include actual mechanical test properties required to be furnished?

Reply: Unless otherwise specifically addressed in the NBIC, all materials, including marking and test reports, shall comply with the original code of construction.

INTERPRETATION 98-36

Subject: RD-2050

1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question: In RD-2050, does the thickness required by the original code of construction refer to the material thickness originally supplied?

Reply: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-35

Subject: RB-4000 Restamping or Replacement of Nameplate

1998 Edition with the 1999 Addendum

Question Do the requirements of RB-4020 apply to vessels that are removed from a
1: plant site or manufacturer's facility and are repaired or altered by an "R"
Certificate Holder?

Reply 1: Yes.

Question May an "R" Certificate Holder attach a replacement nameplate supplied by the
2: original manufacturer, after proper identification has been established and in
the presence of an Inspector, on an ASME vessel?

Reply 2: Yes, provided all requirements of RB-4000 are met.

Question When a nameplate is to be placed on an ASME vessel, which jurisdiction must
3: approve the attachment of the replacement nameplate?

Reply 3: The jurisdiction where the vessel is located.

Question When the original manufacturer is no longer in business, may an "R"
4: Certificate Holder provide a replacement nameplate describing the design
conditions of the ASME vessel?

Reply 4: No. The jurisdiction should be contacted when the original manufacturer is no longer in business.

INTERPRETATION 98-34

Subject: RC-3030 Examination and Testing

1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question: When the design rated capacity of a boiler is increased without physical work such that the design pressure and temperature are unaffected, is it required to perform a pressure test in accordance with the NBIC?

Reply: No.

INTERPRETATION 98-33

Subject: RC-2051 Liquid Pressure Test of Repairs

1998 Edition

Question: Is it a requirement of the NBIC that a liquid pressure test be applied after a repair?

Reply: No. The “R” Certificate Holder is required to verify the integrity of the repair. The combination of tests and/or examinations to be performed is subject to the acceptance of the Inspector and, where required, the jurisdiction.

INTERPRETATION 98-32

Subject: RC-3022 Re-rating Using Higher Joint Efficiency Allowed by Later Edition of Original Code of Construction
1998 Edition

Question: Is it permissible to re-rate a pressure vessel using an increased joint efficiency of 1.0 in accordance with a later edition/addenda of the original code of construction if all of the butt joints were 100% radiographed in the original construction?

Reply: No.

INTERPRETATION 98-31

Subject: RC-2031 Replacement of a Nozzle as Routine Repair
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addenda

Question: Is the replacement of a nozzle which is NPS 5 or less considered a routine repair regardless of weld thickness?

Reply: No, RC-2031 (a)(1) does not address nozzles.

INTERPRETATION 98-30

Subject: Appendix 6C Example of Alteration Due to Grinding or Machining
1998 Edition

Question A pressure-retaining item has its surface ground or machined to remove
1: imperfections caused during operation. Is the resulting reduction in outside diameter, length, and thickness caused by such grinding or machining considered an alteration as described in Appendix 6, Item C4?

Reply 1: No, unless the changes affect the pressure-containing capability of the pressure-retaining item.

Question A pressure-retaining item has its surface ground or machined to remove
2: imperfections caused during operation. The grinding and machining reduces the item’s thickness, length and outside diameter. Must such grinding or machining be performed by a holder of an “R” Certificate of Authorization?

Reply 2: No.

INTERPRETATION 98-29

Subject: Appendix 6 Tube Placement
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question Is the replacement of heat exchanger tube material with a material that has a
1: different nominal composition and an allowable stress equal to or greater than the original material considered a repair?

Reply 1: Yes, provided that the thickness of the replacement material is equal to or greater than the original material thickness, and provided the replacement material satisfies the material and design requirements of the original code of construction under which the vessel was built.

Question Is the replacement of heat exchanger tube material with a material that has a
2: different nominal composition and an allowable stress less than the original material considered an alteration?

Reply 2: Yes. See Appendix 6, C7.

Question May tube replacement(s) be considered a routine repair if authorization is
3: obtained in accordance with RC-2030?

Reply 3: Yes, provided the tube material is NPS 5 or less.

Question Does the NBIC require a tube replacement, which is considered to be a repair,
4: to be documented on an R-1 Form when no welding is performed?

Reply 4: No. The NBIC does not address the documentation of non-welded repairs.

INTERPRETATION 98-28

Subject: RC-1050(c) Replacement Parts Fabricated by an “R” Certificate Holder
Appendix 6 Pressure Retaining Replacement Items
RC-1050 Definition of New Replacement Parts
1998 Edition

Question Does RC-1050(c) of the NBIC permit the holder of an “R” Certificate to
1: fabricate by welding new and exact pressure retaining replacement parts for an ASME stamped item that the “R” stamp holder is repairing?

Reply 1: No. ASME replacement parts fabricated by welding that require shop inspection by an Authorized Inspector shall be fabricated by an organization having an appropriate ASME Certificate of Authorization.

Question An ASME stamped item is determined to be corroded beyond repair and the
2: only salvageable part is the ASME Code stamping or nameplate. Is it the intent of the NBIC to permit a holder of an “R” Certificate only to build a complete new and exact pressure retaining replacement item using the original ASME construction Code, Section, Edition and Addenda and same materials, transfer and document the transfer of the ASME stamping or nameplate on an R-1 Form to the new pressure-retaining item and stamp the repair with the “R” stamp?

Reply 2: No.

Question Does the NBIC define the point at which a repair becomes new construction?
3:

Reply 3: No.

INTERPRETATION 98-27

Subject: RC-2050(b) Pressure Testing
RC-1050 Replacement Parts
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question Does the term replacement parts, as used in RC-2050(b), include replacement
1: parts as defined in RC-1050(a)?

Reply 1: No. RC-1050(a) describes parts supplied as material on which no fabrication welding is performed.

Question Is it the intent of the 1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum that the term
2: replacement parts, as used in RC-2050(b), include replacement parts as defined in RC-1050(b)?

Reply 2: No. The 1997 Addendum clarifies these requirements.

Question Does the term replacement parts, as used in RC-2050(b), include replacement
3: parts as defined in RC-1050(c) and RC-1050(d)?

Reply 3: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-26

Subject: RA-2262(b)(1)
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addenda

Question: May the spring on a pressure relief valve be reset within the guidelines of ASME Section 1, PG-72.3 or Section VIII, Div. 1, UG-126(c), as applicable, provided the repair activities are within the scope stated on the “VR” holder’s certificate and the requirements of paragraph RA-2262(b)(1) are met?

Reply: Yes, provided the set pressure is within the manufacturer’s spring range.

INTERPRETATION 98-25

Subject: RA-2262(b)(3)
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addenda

Question: Does RA-2262(b)(3) require the repair organization to mark out the type/model number if the type/model number was changed prior to the implementation of RA-2262(b)(3)?

Reply: Yes, and the new type or model number shall be stamped on the repair nameplate in accordance with paragraph RA-2262-(a)(7).

INTERPRETATION 98-24

Subject: Restricted Lift per Code Case 1923 & 1945
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addenda

Question: May a “VR” Certificate holder perform a conversion, as defined in RA-

2242(c), of a pressure relief valve from one certified design type to another certified type which was certified by the manufacturer in accordance with ASME Code Cases 1923 or 1945?

Reply: Yes, provided all NBIC requirements pertaining to conversions are met and the certificate holder receives from the valve manufacturer specifications and instructions which include the additional marking requirements of the applicable code case.

INTERPRETATION 98-23

Subject: Appendix 6, B-7
1995 Edition with the 1995 Addendum

Question: Is the head or shell thickness limited to 3/8 in. in thickness when installing a new NPS 3 nozzle as stated in Appendix 6, paragraph B-7?

Reply: No. The example is correct for a vessel constructed in accordance with ASME Code, Section VIII, Division 1.

INTERPRETATION 98-22

Subject: RC-1010 Scope
1998 Edition

Question Does the NBIC address ASME B31 piping codes?
1:

Reply 1: Yes. See the definition of “pressure-retaining item” in Appendix 4.

Question Is a nameplate required for piping system repairs/alterations performed in
2: accordance with the NBIC?

Reply 2: Yes.

Question When multiple repairs or alterations are described on a single “R” data report
3: form, may a single nameplate be used?

Reply 3: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-21

Subject: RA-2130 (f)
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question: Is it required that an applicant for an “R” Certificate of Authorization, whose program includes repair of ASME Section VIII, Division 2 pressure vessels, demonstrate the capability to comply with the applicable requirements of RC-2080 to ensure the program satisfies RA-2130 (f)?

Reply: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-20

Subject: RC-3022 Re-rating
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question Is derating a vessel to a lower MAWP considered an alteration or a re-rating?
1:

Reply 1: Neither. The NBIC does not address derating. See RC-3022, footnote 1.

Question In lieu of derating a corroded vessel and affixing nameplates with the new
2: MAWP, may the pressure relief device set pressure be reduced to less than the calculated MAWP based upon actual remaining wall thickness, if the calculations are conducted in accordance with RC-3020 and RC-3021?

Reply 2: This is outside the scope of the NBIC. The jurisdiction in which the pressure vessel is located should be contacted to determine the specific procedures to be followed.

INTERPRETATION 98-19

Subject: RB-3237 Inspection Interval
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question: Where there are services in which pressure-retaining items are used which restrict human access due to radiological or toxicological concerns, is it permissible to utilize degradation analysis to extend the interval, or exempt the vessel from internal or on-stream evaluation?

Reply: Yes, provided it is acceptable to the jurisdiction (see RB-1000). The NBIC provides guidance only in establishing inspection intervals or exemptions (see RB-3237 and RB-3238). The jurisdiction is the final authority on inspection intervals or exemptions.

INTERPRETATION 98-18

Subject: RC-2031 (a)(1) Routine Repairs
1998 Edition with the 1998 Addendum

Question: In RC-2031 (a)(1), does the phrase “and their attachments” refer to items such as: flanges, welded couplings, welded fittings for thermometers or pressure gages, or other types of pressure-retaining items?

Reply: No.

INTERPRETATION 98-17

Subject: RA-2281 Testing Medium and Testing Equipment
1998 Edition

Question: For testing in accordance with paragraph RA-2281(a), is it permissible to use the 1998 ASME Code Section I blowdown requirements for valves built to earlier Code editions?

Reply: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-16

Subject: RA-3020 Prerequisites for Accreditation
1998 Edition

Question: May an Inspector, holding a National Board Owner-User Commission and employed by an Owner-User Inspection Organization, perform inspections at more than one of his/her employer's facilities which are National Board accredited Owner-User Organizations?

Reply: Yes, provided this is described in each Quality System Manual and is acceptable to the jurisdiction(s) where the inspections will be performed.

INTERPRETATION 98-15

Subject: RC-3022 & RC-3030(h) Pressure Testing Requirements Related to
Re-rating Activities
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question If calculations and current thickness measurements indicate that a pressure-
1: retaining item may be altered by re-rating only (no physical work being done), may the original pressure test as recorded on the Manufacturer's Data Report be used to satisfy RC-3022(d), if the pressure test is at least equal to the calculated test pressure required to verify the integrity of said alteration, subject to the approval of the Inspector and the requirements of the jurisdiction?

Reply 1: Yes.

Question If the maximum allowable working pressure (MAWP) of a pressure-retaining
2: item must be reduced, due to wall thinning below the minimum wall thickness required to contain the MAWP stated on the manufacturer's data report and on the ASME stamped nameplate, but the maximum allowable temperature is increased, is it the intent of the NBIC that this be considered a re-rate?

Reply 2: Yes. Any increase in pressure or temperature is considered a re-rate in accordance with RC-3022.

Question If the maximum allowable working pressure (MAWP) of a pressure-retaining
3: item must be reduced, due to wall thinning below the minimum wall thickness required to contain the MAWP stated on the manufacturer's data report and on the ASME stamped nameplate, but the maximum allowable temperature is increased, is it the intent of the NBIC that this is, in effect, a derate and outside the scope of the NBIC?

Reply 3: No. Any increase in pressure or temperature is considered a re-rate in accordance with RC-3022.

INTERPRETATION 98-14

Subject: Appendix 6, Examples of Repairs and Alterations

RC-1050 Replacement Parts
RC-3022 Re-rating
RC-3020 Design
1998 Edition

Question Does the example of an alteration given in Appendix 6, paragraph C.7, for
1: replacement of a pressure retaining part with a material of different allowable stress from that used in the original design, apply to use of the same material when later editions/addenda of the original code of construction permit higher allowable stresses for that material?

Reply 1: Yes, when use of the higher allowable stress value results in a reduction in material thickness.

Question Does the example of a repair given in Appendix 6, paragraph B.17, for
2: replacement of a pressure retaining part with a material of different nominal composition and equal or greater allowable stress from that used in the original design, apply to use of the same material when later editions/addenda of the original code of construction permit higher allowable stresses for that material?

Reply 2: Yes, provided there is no reduction in material thickness.

Question When a replacement part is constructed using higher allowable stress values
3: permitted by a later edition/addenda of the original code of construction and the replacement part is thinner than the part being replaced, is it required that an "R" Certificate Holder perform calculations and inspections to verify that the connecting welds and the affected portions of the pressure-retaining items are in compliance with the original code of construction?

Reply 3: Yes.

Question May a pressure-retaining item be re-rated using a later edition/addenda of the
4: original code of construction which permits higher allowable stress values for the material than was used in the original construction?

Reply 4: Yes, in compliance with the following minimum criteria:

- a. The "R" Certificate Holder verifies (by calculations and other means) that the re-rated item can be satisfactorily operated at the new service conditions (e.g., stiffness, buckling, external mechanical loadings, etc.),
- b. The pressure-retaining item is not used for lethal service,
- c. The pressure-retaining item is not in high-cycle operation or fatigue service (i.e., loadings other than primary membrane stress are controlling design considerations.),
- d. The pressure-retaining item was constructed to the 1968 Edition or later edition/addenda of the original code of construction,
- e. The pressure-retaining item is shown to comply with all relevant requirements of the edition/addenda of the code of construction which permits the higher allowable stress values (e.g., reinforcement, toughness, examination, pressure testing, etc.),
- f. The pressure-retaining item has a satisfactory operating history and

- current inspection of the pressure-retaining item verifies that the item exhibits no unrepaired damage (e.g., cracks, corrosion, erosion, etc.),
- g. The re-rating is acceptable to the Inspector and, where required, the jurisdiction,
 - h. All other requirements of Part RC are met, and
 - i. Use of this Interpretation is documented in the Remarks Section of Form R2.

Question May a new minimum required wall thickness be calculated for a pressure-retaining item by using a later edition/addenda of the original code of construction which permits higher allowable stress values for the material than was used in the original construction?

Reply 5: Yes, in compliance with the following minimum criteria:

- a. The “R” Certificate Holder verifies (by calculations and other means) that the affected portions of the pressure-retaining item can be satisfactorily operated (e.g., stiffness, buckling, external mechanical loadings, etc.),
- b. The pressure-retaining item is not used for lethal service,
- c. The pressure-retaining item is not in high-cycle operation or fatigue service (i.e., loadings other than primary membrane stress are controlling design considerations.),
- d. The pressure-retaining item was constructed to the 1968 Edition or later edition/addenda of the original code of construction,
- e. The pressure-retaining item is shown to comply with all relevant requirements of the edition/addenda of the code of construction which permits the higher allowable stress values (e.g., reinforcement, toughness, examination, pressure testing, etc.),
- f. The pressure-retaining item has a satisfactory operating history and current inspection of the pressure-retaining item verifies that the item exhibits no unrepaired damage (e.g., cracks, etc.). Areas of corrosion or erosion may be left in place provided the remaining wall thickness is greater than the new minimum thickness,
- g. The design change is acceptable to the Inspector and, where required, the jurisdiction,
- h. All other requirements of Part RC are met, and
- i. Use of this Interpretation is documented in the Remarks Section of Form R2.

INTERPRETATION 98-13

Subject: RA-2151r
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question: Does RA-2151r require an “R” Certificate Holder to list or reference, in the

Quality System Manual, the specific construction codes that may be used while performing repairs or alterations?

Reply: No; however, the Quality System Manual must include provisions for addressing requirements imposed by specific construction codes used for repairs and alterations.

INTERPRETATION 98-12

Subject: Use of Code Case 2203 in Repairs
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question: Under the provisions of paragraph RA-2231(b)(1), is it permissible to apply ASME Code Case 2203 and convert a pressure relief valve by removing the lifting device that is required by Section VIII, Division 1, paragraph UG-136(a)(3) and Section VIII, Division 2, paragraph I-101?

Reply: Yes, provided that the “VR” Certificate Holder verifies that:

1. All of the requirements of ASME Code Case 2203 are met, and
2. That all of the requirements of the NBIC concerning conversions, and specifically, paragraphs R-2231(b)(2) and RA-2262(b)(3) are met.

INTERPRETATION 98-11

Subject: RA-3050
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question Are inservice inspections performed under the Owner-User accreditation

- 1: program valid when the inspected items are intended for lease or rent, or installed for use at other locations?

Reply 1: No.

Question Are repair inspections performed by an Owner-User inspection organization

- 2: valid when the item(s) repaired are intended for lease or rent, or installed for use at another organization’s location?

Reply 2: No.

Question May an inspector who is employed by an accredited Owner-User inspection

- 3: organization perform repair authorization and acceptance inspections for pressure-retaining items not owned or used by the Owner-User accredited inspection organization?

Reply 3: No.

INTERPRETATION 98-10

Subject: RC-1110
1995 Edition

Question Do the butt welded joints used to replace a portion of a tube sheet in an ASME
1: Section I firetube boiler require the same nondestructive examination as longitudinal butt welded joints in an ASME Section I boiler?

Reply 1: Yes.

Question If the Reply to question #1 above is “Yes” and the NDE requirements of the
2: original code of construction are not possible or practicable, may alternative NDE methods be used?

Reply 2: Yes, RC-1110 permits the use of alternative NDE methods that are acceptable to the Inspector and, where required, the jurisdiction.

INTERPRETATION 98-09

Subject: RB-3640
1995 Edition

Question: Does the NBIC (NBIC) require an atmospheric deaerator vessel to be inspected in accordance with part RB-3640?

Reply: No. Part RB provides recommendations for the conduct of inspections; however, the jurisdiction may mandate the use of RB-3600.

INTERPRETATION 98-08

Subject: RD-2010 Scope
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question: May a “blister” in a pressure-retaining item be repaired by the drilling of a hole in the center of the blister, hammering the blister flat, and rewelding the hole?

Reply: When the NBIC does not specify or otherwise limit the repair technique to be used, it is the responsibility of the “R” Certificate Holder with the concurrence of the Inspector to choose the appropriate technique. However, the chosen technique must remove the defect.

INTERPRETATION 98-07

Subject: RA-2330(d)
1995 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question If an ASME Section III component is installed in a location outside the ASME
1: Section XI program boundary, is it a requirement of RA-2330(d) that ASME Section XI activities (e.g., VT-2 examination) be performed as part of an “NR” repair or replacement activity?

Reply 1: Yes.

Question Is it permissible for an Owner to use an ASME Section III component
2: previously installed in a location outside of the Section XI program boundary in a location within the ASME Section XI boundary as long as all previous

work performed on the item was performed in accordance with NBIC requirements?

Reply 2: Yes, provided the component is examined in accordance with the appropriate ASME Section XI requirements for its intended use.

INTERPRETATION 98-06

Subject: RC-1090 Welding
RD-1010 Scope
1998 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question May the rules of the original code of construction be used for welding non-
1: pressure parts to a pressure-retaining item?

Reply 1: Yes.

Question Is it required that the alternative methods shown in RD-1000 be applied to
2: repairs and alterations?

Reply 2: No. RD-1000 includes alternatives that may be used in lieu of the original code of construction. When an alternative method is used, all requirements of the alternative must be met.

INTERPRETATION 98-05

Subject: Foreword
1998 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question: Do the rules of the NBIC require the repair of a pressure-retaining item when the pressure-retaining item no longer complies with the original code of construction?

Reply: No, the NBIC does not provide rules for determining when a repair must be performed. (See RB-3180 and RB-3280).

INTERPRETATION 98-04

Subject: RC-2031 Routine Repair
1998 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question Does RC-2031(a)(1) limit routine repairs to a single tube or pipe?
1:

Reply 1: No.

Question May the repair of more than one tube or pipe be classified as a routine repair?
2:

Reply 2: Yes, subject to the acceptance of the jurisdiction and the Inspector.

INTERPRETATION 98-03

Subject: RB-3238 Interrupted Service

1998 Edition with the 1995 Addendum

Question Does paragraph RB-3238(f) of the NBIC define when a pressure vessel is
1: inservice or out-of-service?

Reply: No, the NBIC does not define out-of-service or in-service. This is subject to jurisdictional requirements.

Question When returning a pressure vessel to service, do the requirements of paragraph
2: RB-3238(f) apply even if the pressure vessel was inspected to other requirements while not inservice?

Reply 2: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-02

Subject: RA-2231 Conditions of Use
1998 Edition with the 1996 Addendum

Question: Does RA-2231(b) require that the ?VR? stamp be applied only to pressure relief valves which meet the following conditions:

- a. the valves are stamped with an ASME “V,” “UV,” or “NV” Code Symbol or marked with an ASME “HV” Symbol and have been capacity certified on the applicable fluid by the National Board; and
- b. have been disassembled, inspected and repaired such that the valve’s condition and performance are equivalent to the standards for new valves in the year they were manufactured?

Reply: Yes.

INTERPRETATION 98-01

Subject: RC-2031(a)(1)
1998 Edition with the 1997 Addendum

Question: In RC-2031(a)(1), does the phrase “and their attachments” refer to such items as:

- a. joining of pipe to pipe and tube to tube;
- b. attachments such as clips, lugs, rings, devices, skirts, etc.;
- c. nozzles and other connections welded to shells, drums and headers?

Reply:

- a. No.
- b. Yes, provided postweld heat treatment is not required by the original code of construction for the attachment weld.
- c. No.

