

## 2007 NBIC Interpretations

### INTERPRETATION 07-16

Subject: Part 3, 3.3.5.2

Edition: 2007

Question: Is the R-Certificate holder required to prepare a detailed repair plan (Part 3, 3.3.5.2) or an alteration plan (Part 3, 4.4.1) covering the scope of work prior to commencement of any work for a Section VIII, Div. 2 or Div. 3 vessel?

Reply: Yes

Question: Is the R-Certificate holder required to have the detailed repair plan or alteration plan reviewed and certified by an Engineer meeting the criteria of ASME Section VIII, Div. 2 or 3 prior to commencing any of the work?

Reply: Yes

### INTERPRETATION 07-15

Subject: Part 2, S2.10.6

Edition: 2007 Edition with 2008 Addendum

Question: Could average pitch be used instead of maximum pitch?

Reply: No

### INTERPRETATION 07-14

Subject: Part 3, 3.3.3

2007 Edition with 2009 Addendum

Question: Does the example of a repair given in Part 3, 3.3.3 s), for 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?

Reply: Yes, provided the minimum required thickness is at least equal to the thickness stated on the Manufacturer's Data Report.

### INTERPRETATION 07-13

Subject: Original Code of Construction

2007 Edition with 2009 Addendum

Question: When the NBIC references "the original code of construction", is it required to use the original edition and addenda of that code as was referenced during the item's original construction?

Reply: No. See Interpretation 95-19

### INTERPRETATION 07-12

Subject: Part 3, 3.4.3

2007 Edition with 2009 Addendum

Question: Does replacing a flat head/end plate with a hemispherical/elliptical head or visa-versa represent a change in contour reflected in the "Examples of Alterations" found in Part 3, 3.4.3 d)?

Reply: Yes.

### INTERPRETATION 07-11

Subject: Part 3, 3.2.2 a)

2007 Edition with 2010 Addendum

Question 1: Is it required that a replacement part to be added by welding to an existing pressure retaining component be supported by a Certificate of Compliance from the Fabricator, when the Fabricator is not the installer of the part, and when the new part is a pipe stub with machined

weld prep?

Reply 1: No. Replacement parts furnished in compliance with Part 3, 3.2.2 a) are supplied as material and do not need a Certificate of Compliance.

Question 2: Is a Certificate of Compliance required for a replacement part under the conditions described in Question 1, where fabrication consists of cutting a tube to length and/or bending of a tube?

Reply 2: No.

Question 3: Is a Certificate of Compliance required to be provided by the Fabricator when a replacement part furnished in compliance with Part 3, 3.2.2 a) is to be used in an alteration?

Reply 3: No.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-10**

Subject: Part 3, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3

2007 Edition with 2009 Addendum

Question: Is it the intent of the NBIC that weld build-up of a damaged gasket surface on a flange where neither PWHT no NDT is required by the code of construction considered a routine repair?

Reply: Yes, provided the "R" Certificate Holder's quality system program describes the process for identifying, controlling and implementing routine repairs.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-09**

Subject: Part 2, S2.9 b) and S2.11 b) 7) b)

2007 Edition with 2008 Addendum

Question: As referenced in Part 2, S2.9 b), is a minimum of schedule 80 pipe required for boiler pressure piping beyond the first stop valve from the boiler?

Reply: No, but it is recommended that a minimum of schedule 80 be used for all external piping.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-08**

Subject: Part 3, 3.4.3 c)

2007 Edition with 2009 Addendum

Question: Is replacement of an original handhole opening on a ASME Section IV boiler with a flush patch containing a welded coupling considered an alteration?

Reply: Yes, in accordance with 3.4.3 c).

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-07**

Subject: Part 3, 3.3.4.3 e), 3.3.2 d) 3)

2007 Edition with 2009 Addendum

Question: May external weld buildup of a wasted area on a pressure retaining item using repair method 3.3.4.3 e) be considered a routine repair?

Reply: No.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-06**

Subject: Part 3

2007 Edition

Question: Is it permissible for pressure parts having been in service from one pressure retaining item to be installed in another pressure retaining item as a replacement part for a repair or alteration?

Reply: Yes, provided the pressure parts are installed in accordance with the requirements of the NBIC, and if applicable, with concurrence from the Jurisdiction.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-05**

Subject: Part 1, 2.9.5.1 c)

2007 Edition with 2008 Addendum

Question: Is a change-over valve as specified in ASME Code Case-2254 permitted for use between a boiler and the required pressure relief valve?

Reply: Yes, provided the change-over valve meets the requirements of ASME Code Case-2254 and NBIC, Part 2, paragraph 2.5.4 i), and is acceptable to the Jurisdiction.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-04**

Subject: Part 1 4.5.1 a)

2007 Edition

Question: Is it permitted to install a new Code stamped/certified rupture disc into an existing disc holder?

Reply: Yes, provided the disc and holder are produced by the same manufacturer, and the holder design is the same as the certified holder for the new rupture disc.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-03**

Subject: Part 3 2.5.3

2007 Edition

Question: Is it the intent of the NBIC to prohibit using Alternative Welding Method 2 on P-No 4 and P-No 5A base materials that are referenced in subsection 2.5.3.2 paragraph d) 3) to subsection 2.5.3.4 paragraph a) in Alternative Welding Method 4 where notch toughness testing was required by the original code of construction?

Reply: No, the reference to 2.5.3.4 a) pertains to repair depth, preheat and interpass temperature limitations.

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-02**

Subject: Part 3 1.6.2, 1.7.5.4, 1.8.2

2007 Edition

Question: In subsections 1.6.2, 1.7.5.4 and 1.8.2 it states that "R," "VR" and "NR" certificate holders must have the current edition and addenda of the *National Board Inspection Code*. Does that statement mean certificate holders must have Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the *National Board Inspection Code*?

Reply: Yes

#### **INTERPRETATION 07-01**

Subject: Part RB-8400 RB-8410

2004 Edition with 2006 Addendum

Question1: Must pressure relief valves be tested for set or opening pressure and reclosing pressures if a "try test" is performed as permitted by the fourth paragraph of RB-8400?

Reply: No.

Question 2: Does the paragraph allowing "try testing" as an alternative to a pressure test eliminate the requirement to test valves with either the system fluid or the fluids specified for testing other than on the system fluid?

Reply 2: No.

Question 3: Does the paragraph in RB-8400 permitting "try testing" as an alternative to a pressure test alter the recommendations in RB-8410?

Reply 3: No.