

2011 NBIC Interpretations

Interpretation 11-06

Subject: Part 3, 3.2.5

Edition: 2011

Question: Q1: Does the NBIC have rules that prevent physical work proceeding on a risk basis prior to the calculations being submitted and reviewed by the Inspector?

Reply: Yes

Q2: Does the requirement in S3.2.5 that calculations be completed prior to the start of any physical work, apply to fabrication of replacement parts as defined in §3.2.2 that will be used in the alteration?

Reply: No

Q3: Does the NBIC prohibit the R Certificate Holder that certifies the design portion of Form R-2 from subcontracting the design calculations provided the R Certificate Holder's quality control system covers subcontracting of design calculations?

Reply: No

Q4: If an alteration involves the installation of a replacement part (as defined in Paragraph 3.2.2 c) that has been designed, fabricated, inspected and stamped in accordance with the original code of construction and for which the part fabricator has documented on the partial data report that they have certified the design of the part for a specific set of design conditions (MAWP,MAWT, MDMT, corrosion allowance, etc.), must the "R" Certificate Holder responsible for executing the Design Certification on the R-2 Form obtain the calculations from the part fabricator and make available for review by the Inspector?

Reply: No; however the R-Certificate holder responsible for executing the "Design Certification" portion of the R-2 Form, must assure himself that the design complies with the NBIC and by signing; the Design Certification accepts responsibility for the design

Interpretation 11-05

Subject: Part 2, Section 5.2.2 through 5.2.3

Edition: 2011

Question: If a National Board Commissioned Inspector has verified the replacement of stamped data or nameplate by an "R" Certificate holder on Corrugated rolls that are not stationary and subject to operation in multiple Jurisdictions, possibly by multiple owners, is the application of NB-136 "Replacement of Stamped Data Form" required for each of the multiple Jurisdictions?

Reply: No. If the vessel is not stationary, application should need only be made in the Jurisdiction where the nameplate is re-applied.

Interpretation 11-04

Subject : Part 3, 1.7

Edition : 2011

Question: May the VR stamp be applied to pressure relief valves bearing the ASME Certification mark with the V, HV, UV, or NV designator?

Reply: Yes

Interpretation 11-03

Subject: Part 2, 2.5.8

Edition: 2011

Question 1: The table of suggested inspection and test frequencies in 2.5.8 f) does not include a column for “test frequency. Does the column heading “Inspection Frequency” include Inspection and Testing”?

Reply 1: Yes

Question 2: May the guidelines for establishing inspection and test frequencies in 2.5.8 g) be used for establishing the frequencies of inspection and test for fluids in the table in 2.5.8 f)?

Reply 2: Yes.

Question 3: Once an acceptable pressure relief device service interval has been established per 2.5.8 h) is it acceptable to replace the pressure relief devices with a new device at the established service interval in lieu of servicing?

Reply 3: Yes

Interpretation 11-02

Subject: Part 3, 4.4.2 a)

Edition: 2011

Question 1) In Part 3, 4.4.2 a) is a liquid pressure test not exceeding 150% of MAWP stamped on the pressure retaining item required for an alteration?

Reply 1) No. In accordance with Part 3, 4.4.2 a) 2), liquid pressure testing of connecting welds not exceeding 150% of MAWP may be tested or examined in accordance with rules for repairs.

Question 2) In Part 3, 4.4.2. a) 2) may a liquid pressure test of connecting welds for a pressure retaining item be performed below 150% of the MAWP for an alteration?

Reply 2: Yes, with acceptance of the Inspector and when required the Jurisdiction. See NBIC Part 3, 4.4

Interpretation 11-01

Subject: Part 3, 3.3.2

Edition: 2011

Question: In Part 3, 3.3.2 d), is the replacement scope or the number of valves, fittings, tubes, or pipe NPS 5 in diameter and smaller, or sections thereof, a consideration when determining if the work is a routine repair?

Reply: No. The NBIC does not address the magnitude of work or scope in qualifying repairs as routine but rather addresses the exceptions representing routine repairs as noted within Part 3, 3.3.2 d) 1)