Task Group on Dispensing Equipment
Teleconference Meeting Summary
June 10, 2014

Participating Members:
Rex Brandt (Taylor Co)     Mike Kohler (NSF International)
Joel Hipp (Hobart Corp)     Girvin Liggans (Food and Drug Administration)

Absent Members:
Tom Johnson (Johnson Diversified Products Inc)  Randy Dyer (Nestle)
Bob Corrao (J.M. Smucker Company)

Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)     Stephen Wadle (Taylor Co)
Cheryl Appell (Manitowoc Foodservice)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
1. FE - 2014 - 1 - Rationale statement, version 2.pdf
3. Meeting Summary - TG on Dispensing Equipment - 12-10-2013 - Final.pdf
4. FE - 2014 - 1 - STD 6, Dispensing Freezers, RPS, including test report.pdf
5. 6i10r1 - Dispensing Freezers and Heat Treatment - Straw Ballot.pdf
6. 6i10r1 - Dispensing Freezers and Heat Treatment - Straw Ballot Description.pdf
7. 6i10r1 - 20140113_HT_MACHINE_FLOW_DIAGRAM.pdf

Discussion
R.Brandt welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Four of the 7 voting members were present (57%) representing a quorum.

A.Rose read the call for membership. The Joint Committee on Food Equipment is currently looking for members in the User category. Please refer interested parties to the Joint Committee Chair or Secretariat, then turned the meeting over to R.Brandt, who explained the planned flow of the meeting and read off the agenda.

Topic 1 – Discuss ballot since previous meeting (6i10r1)
R.Brandt provided a brief background and confirmed the vote was 28:0:0 (affirmative : negative : abstain) with 2 comments

Comment #1 – Jim Brady
Read off comment and proposed solution:
Comment
"Use of the term product reservoir is continually used in the standard for machines with non-prepackaged product. Machines with prepackaged product really don’t have a product reservoir in that sense and the term is used in the proposed wording in 6.3.2.2 Thermocouple #1 location.”
Proposed Solution

6.3.2.2

Thermocouple #1: ...in the middle of the pre-packaged product.
This is also the term used in the rationale which seems more applicable.

R.Brandt asked the group for their thoughts. J.Hipp stated he was neutral on this. R.Brandt asked A.Rose if this change was substantive and would need to be re-balloted to which A.Rose responded yes. J.Hipp suggested the group discuss comment b first and decide. If we need to re-ballot based on comment b than we can include the first, otherwise we will keep the wording the same.

Comment #2 – Girvin Liggans
Read off comment and proposed solution:
Comment

6.5.2 Test Method makes clear how the challenge suspension shall be introduced to a machine with non pre-packaged product (product reservoir), however, it is unclear how the challenge suspension will be introduced to a machine with pre-packaged product.

Proposed Solution - None

R.Brandt then explained the process of the test. R.Brandt asked G.Liggans if he wanted to add anything to his written comment. G.Liggans added that as we break out what is pre packaged and what is not, we need to be clear how the challenge suspension is introduced to the package. R.Brandt explained that the prepackaged product has a section unto itself and the group discussed.

G.Liggans said if that is the case, there is still a portion that must be heat treated. So how would we add that to the standard. M.Kohler said ultimately the kill step is important and reducing the load by 10x^4 is what matters. How the challenge solution is added isn’t important and varies depending on the machine. The machine is successfully challenged if there is this reduction versus the control suspension. M.Kohler then provided the group an example of a precedent in another standard.

G.Liggans said this makes sense but if I have a machine that is prepackage versus not, how would I know this by reading the standard. J.Hipp asked the group if we can add more words to clarify, to which R.Brandt stated if you look at the header (read off the header for 6.5.2.1 and 6.5.2.2) it clearly distinguishes. Either someone follows the non pre-packaged or pre-packaged instructions. We are challenging the machine in the same manner regardless.

G.Liggans asked M.Kohler if this gives him a uniform understanding of what needs to happen, to which M.Kohler said yes it is clear to us what is involved. M.Kohler further added if we get too specific we will have to change the standard each time a new design is introduced.
R.Brandt then asked G.Liggans if he was ok with the original language to which G.Liggans said yes. Then asked the group if they were ok with the language and to move this forward in the balloting process. The group agreed.

**Action Item:**
1) A.Rose to prepare ballot for CPHC; discuss timing with R.Brandt and M.Perez

**Topic 2 – Issue Paper FE-2014-1**

R.Brandt introduced the issue paper and said he spoke with T.Johnson since. R.Brandt asked A.Rose to bring up the statement on Readytalk as well as the rationale statement. R.Brandt then read off meaning of section 5.28 and gave the members a minute to read each rationale statement.

*Rationale statement A)*

R.Brandt asked if anybody had any discussion points. J.Hipp said the rationale statement makes sense; C.Appell agreed.

*Rationale statement B)*

R.Brandt asked if anybody had any discussion points. J.Hipp said it seems like there’s a lot of detail about how it works. R.Brandt added that since T.Johnson isn’t here to talk to his point, this is helpful. R.Brandt asked M.Kohler if he had any discussion with T.Johnson to which M.Kohler said not yet. R.Brandt asked G.Liggans this is another example of your challenge question. How will this be accomplished?

M.Kohler commented on section 5.28.3; the statement “include a digital temperature indicator device” may open a can of worms. There’s never been a requirement for measuring this on the machine directly. Not necessarily a bad idea, but not required in other performance testing. Maybe his statement in the last sentence is already covered in the current performance standard.

R.Brandt said he believes there is language for this to verify temperature requirements already in the standard such that the sensor will be in the middle of the feed line. Since this falls within the 7.5 feet or less, it’s already halfway in between. If we follow the same logic with T.Johnson’s proposed language changes, it is possible there will only be one thermocouple at 25 feet.

M.Kohler asked A.Rose to bring up the current standard 6 and look at section 6.2 performance requirements.

M.Kohler read off 6.2.1 and 6.2.3:

**6.2.1 Performance requirement**

Product shall be maintained at a temperature of 41 °F (5 °C) or less while held in the product reservoir(s), the dispensing head, and the remote product supply systems (if provided) of the
dispensing freezer. This requirement does not apply during the heat treatment cycle of a heat
treatment dispensing freezer. This requirement also does not apply to batch dispensing freezers
that do not have a product reservoir.

6.2.3 Acceptance criteria

The product temperature at each sensor location shall not exceed 41 °F (5 °C) for the duration of
the test.

R.Brandt said the real question here then is the current remote product supply line is 7.5 feet and this could
go to 50 feet. R.Brandt asked the group if we should add language of specific distance. M.Kohler said this
would be a good idea since there is no specific distance listed currently even in the short distance. We
typically go the farthest point since this is the worst case spot. The distance is at our discretion. M.Kohler
added he thinks some of his language should actually be captured in this section, not just the sections
T.Johnson has currently written language for. Right now it says a thermometer is only required if you have a
refrigerated cabinet.

R.Brandt asked what is the group’s position here? The issue paper specifically lists 12” and refers to line
and freezer chamber. We don’t want to be specific to design elements in the event another manufacturer
applies a different method. Question – should we suggest to T.Johnson to develop language for sections 6.2
for the 50 foot line sets?

M.Kohler said we should evaluate and test regardless if it’s 10, 20, 30 or 50 feet. The language should
include whatever distance enters in between 7.5 feet and 50 feet. M.Kohler added he thinks there is a need
to adjust this language as to where thermocouple(s) should be added regardless of this issue paper. This
group should develop language that is certain feet apart, or exit of refrigerator, half way and one at end
point, than 3 points are covered regardless of the length.

R.Brandt to M.Kohler – how will this affect units already approved by NSF; would they need to be retested
at these 3 locations? M.Kohler said most likely not; we do a worst case at our discretion anyway so most of
the time these have already been tested.

R.Brandt asked the group to go back to rationale statement. Question to M.Kohler – are we concentrating on
5.28.3 such that everything from the word “freezer” to rest of sentence you are looking to strike? To which
M.Kohler said very possibly.

R.Brandt should we go back to T.Johnson and make this suggestion? J.Hipp said yes. M.Kohler added all
the RPS systems must be capable to measure temperature control in accordance with 6.2. Then we should
modify 6.2 to be specific with thermocouple locations.

R.Brandt asked if there were any other comments.
Overarching question from M.Kohler: if we modify 6.2, do we even need section 5.28.3? Nowhere else in the standard does it say we must meet the 41°F or less except in the performance section. If so, then section 5.23 title would need to be modified as well.

R.Brandt asked G.Liggans what the FDA position is on this. G.Liggans said that even at 18 inches, that wasn’t part of the original discussion. He agreed with M.Kohler that this is really part of the performance testing and if written correctly shouldn’t be needed in 5.28. C.Appell also agreed.

R.Brandt said if the specific word “digital” is something we are considering then it should indeed go into 5.28 and create a sub-section.

**Action Item:**
2) R.Brandt to discuss with T.Johnson once meeting summary is complete.

R.Brandt asked if there were any other items to discuss. No comments from the group so he thanked everyone and adjourned.

**Action Items**
1) A.Rose to prepare ballot for CPHC; discuss timing with R.Brandt and M.Perez
2) R.Brandt to discuss with T.Johnson once meeting summary is complete.