Participating Members:
Rex Brandt (Taylor Co)     Mike Kohler (NSF International)
Bob Corrao (J.M. Smucker Company)   Girvin Liggans (Food and Drug Administration)
Tom Johnson (Johnson Diversified Products Inc)

Absent Members:
Randy Dyer (Nestle)      Joel Hipp (Hobart Corp)

Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)     Cheryl Appell (Manitowoc Foodservice)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
1) Agenda - TG on Dispensing Equipment - 07-29-2014
2) NSF 6 - Remote Supply Systems - Draft 7-28-2014
4) FE - 2014 - 1 - STD 6, Dispensing Freezers, RPS, including test report.pdf

Discussion
R.Brandt welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Five of the 7 voting members were present (71%) 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 CPHC ballot comments
R.Brandt confirmed the ballot actually closes 8/1, but wanted to discuss the current comments. A.Rose presented the list and R.Brandt read off the comments.

Comment 1 – T.Schonrock
"The requirement is presented as "Thermocouple # 4: located in all product transfer circuits." How can one thermocouple be placed at ALL product transfer circuits? There must be multiple circuits within the equipment; i.e., reservoir to freezing barrel, freezing barrel to dispensing head, by-pass circuits, etc.

R.Brandt said it appears that he is asking if the language suggests there is only one thermocouple. M.Kohler said it seems like this might be a simple interpretation issue. The intent is when the thermocouples are numbered out they each have a specific location. T.Schonrock is suggesting there could be one circuit or many circuits. What is meant is “a” thermocouple per circuit. M.Kohler suggested the task group either
explain to the commenter or change the language slightly. R.Brandt suggested the group address during the next conference call after the ballot was complete.

Comment 2 – T.Schonrock

The current requirement states, "Upon completion of the test described in 6.3.2, a second heat treatment cycle shall be started. The ambient temperature in the controlled environment shall be increased to 86 ± 3 °F (30 ± 2 °C)." However, there is no justification or acceptance criteria for conducting this test. It is not clear why it is necessary. Acceptance or failure of the original heat treatment test should be sufficient.

R.Brandt confirmed we want to make this as hard as possible to pass. M.Kohler added he appears to be looking at subsections in the middle instead of the entire section 6.3. R.Brandt again suggested the group address this during the next conference call after the ballot was complete.


R.Brandt highlighted brief discussion from previous teleconference:

Group questioned the need to update to 5.2.8, which T.Johnson had originally crossed out and added several new sections. M.Kohler had written a proposal to 5.2.8 update and 6.2. Group was given this document yesterday and R.Brandt read off changes using ReadyTalk and gave the group a couple minutes to absorb before commenting.

M.Kohler explained that what the group was getting at is 1) can this be cleaned in place, and 2) can this maintain temperature within 50 feet. At the previous teleconference the group agreed that much of the language was specific to a particular design and need to be left open to other design possibilities. He provided the example of digital thermometers and confirmed to T.Johnson that the group took his intent and tried to fit it into the current standard for discussion today. T.Johnson confirmed what M.Kohler had written was perfectly fine. This leaves the standard very much the same and in a non-overcomplicated way to express the issue. B.Corrao agreed.

R.Brandt asked if this is intended to be a one way feed from a mix reservoir to the machine with no return. T.Johnson confirmed that during operation it is indeed a one way feed when mix is being pumped. When CIP is engaged however it is re-circulated, which is the point of the system. R.Brandt asked if the group should include some language in the second paragraph to include “each” supply line.

A.Rose pulled up the document for the group to evaluate and changed to “each product tube” from “the product tubing”. Additionally, “The” remote supply line to “each” remote supply line. R.Brandt asked the group if everyone agreed, to which there was no disagreement.

R.Brandt suggested rationale statements be included before sending to the task group for straw ballot. T.Johnson confirmed the rationale statement is in the issue paper and nothing has changed.
R.Brandt asked if there were any other topics to discuss to which none were offered. He thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting

**Action Items**

1) Review CPHC results; between meetings R.Brandt to work with A.Rose, M.Kohler and M.Perez to address comments received

2) T.Johnson to develop rationale statements. Straw ballot with the other language at the task group level before moving to Joint Committee.