

Reunion : EBL. TE. FRA. RN. CKL.

Sunday 8-1-76.

Objet : Spherical Ring (Th. 2.)

1. The situation

1.1 Magnaflux showed indications out of the standards.

R.N. said CKL a PV which indicated that the piece was rejected.

Then because of delay CKL and RN decided to recheck the piece. (RN estimated that a repair was possible.)

RN asked them to have the authorization to machine the defects (CKL accepted but refused that the repairs be done in Cockwith.).

CKL asked to RN to present all the examination of this area. (CKL assisted this extra examination).

To day RN presents the results of those examinations.

1.2. A new indication was found in the piece by UT yesterday.

dimensions : 50 x 10 mm.

10 mm below the machining surface.

(CKL asked to RN to not remove this indication because the groove is already at $\frac{1}{3}$ T.)

2. R.N. explanations:

- 2.1 RN explains that the defect are due to hydrogen flaps. flukes.
- 2 - FRA states that the delay are very possible even in case of repair because this operation is very difficult.
RN answers that the new ingot is already ordered.
- 3 - CKL insists on the fact that he did not ask the repair.
- 4 - FRA says that the weld would take place in an area with a important hydrogen content. (RN answers that this region has not a too high hydrogen content.)
- 5 - The new ingot will be at RN early next week (in any case RN will preforge this new ingot.)
- 6 - If RN machined more than $\frac{1}{3} T$ then the repair has to be examined in service (ASME XI.).
1. - The ASTM SA 508 asks that one examine the defect by bepaning or other way but then one go wider than $\frac{1}{3} T$ for the remaining defects. (mainly for the mentioned § 1.2 of this minute.)

3. Planning:

- 3.1 The new piece would be ready for the 23 april.
- 3.2 If the qualifications are accepted by CKL and the Customers and FRA, the repaired piece would be ready end of february.
(Spec. accepted for the 20/1/76.)

4. Frawolome conclusions:

- 4.1. It is necessary to remove all the defects of the piece.
 - 4.2. " " " " perform some extra tests before welding.
- In front of this position the Customers can not accept the repair.
(ASME XI.)

5. Qualifications:

The qualifications of RN are done on SA 533 and not 508.

SA 654 asks for same grade and same type in case of repair.
(This requirement is met by the RN qualifications.)

6. General conclusions:

Repair is unacceptable:

- Suspect metal in the boundary of the weld repair.
- indications remaining (after $1/3T$.)
- qualifications ^(competency) not in accordance with ECR (with possible delay.)
- delay very probable due to the repair - (results of contract.)

all these considerations bring to rejection of this item.

- According to ASME XI the defect ^{§.12} is in the range of the unacceptable weld defect (EBL ref. IWB-3511.1)

The customer and CMC and FRA ask to RN not to scrap this piece, because in the future in front of a big delay problem (due to the fact that the new piece would not be good.) the customer would accept eventually a reserve inspection of the repair.

85
Middelen
Middelen

40
Middelen
50
20/40
Middelen
40
Middelen

30
Middelen

30/50
Middelen
15
Middelen

30/40
Middelen

10

9

8

50
Middelen

10/20
Middelen

10/20
Middelen

35
Middelen

9

11

10

10/20
Middelen

50
Middelen

ven- het en de 10/10/17

