**Participating Members:**
Rex Brandt (Taylor Co)     Cheryl Appell (Manitowoc Foodservice)
Tom Johnson (Johnson Diversified Products Inc)   Joel Hipp (Hobart Corp)
Girvin Liggans (Food and Drug Administration)   Mike Kohler (NSF International)

**Absent Members:**
Randy Dyer (Nestle)
Bob Corrao (J.M. Smucker Company)

**Participating observers:**
Al Rose (NSF International)

**Supplemental Materials Referenced**
2) 6i11r1 - Remote Product Supply Systems - Straw Ballot.pdf
3) 6i11r1 - Remote Product Supply Systems - Straw Ballot Description.pdf

**Discussion**
R.Brandt welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Six of the 7 voting members were present (86%) representing a quorum. A.Rose 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 results – 6i10r2*
R.Brandt read off results and reminded everyone what the issue paper was all about. He indicated that the results were 20:0:0 (affirmative : negative : abstain) and that there were no comments with which to attend. Confirmed this was ready for publishing and would work with A.Rose on the timing.

*Topic #2 – T.Johnson’s Issue Paper – FE-2014-1 and ballot 6i11r1*
T.Johnson read off the original straw ballot language and confirmed the intent was with the external remote supply system where Liquid Mix is being conveyed. A.Rose presented the current revision which included any feedback from the original straw ballot. Revisions to the original straw ballot appeared in Yellow. Three of the four revisions were with respect to adding the term “external” to illustrate the fact that the mix was being conveyed from an entirely remote system.

T.Johnson then brought up the fourth revision, specifically the statement:

*The manufacturer shall supply an approved temperature measurement system with*

Which led to about 30 minutes of discussion.
T.Johnson confirmed his client intends to use an external device, but after speaking with R.Brandt and M.Kohler on the subject, and understanding this isn’t part of other standards, would not have an issue in dropping from the language completely. This is what they consider an industry best practice and will include with their design but understands if it gets removed from the language.

J.Hipp added to T.Johnson’s discussion about an internal thermocouple causing turbulence; asked if there is another way to measure with a surface sensor. T.Johnson indicated he had looked into this option and was unaware of any type of sensor that won’t cause some sort of turbulence and won’t require some sort of cleanout due to biofilm development. M.Kohler said the original proposal made for extending the length of the remote product lines has no issue. However, the temperature indicating device portion of the issue paper states we are looking at the ± 3.5 °F. We must follow the FDA Food Code requirements of ± 2.0 °F.

T.Johnson provided the thought process of how the method was developed. Specifically, his client operates under quality temperature parameters which are temperatures below that needed for wholesomeness and food safety reasons. Thus, the temperature of mix is always going to be 3°F below that of the chamber. M.Kohler reminded the group their charge is to establish standards that are not specific per manufacturer. T.Johnson asked the group at large whether or not they thought a sensor was necessary. M.Kohler added if the group wants to require a sensor, it will need to be prescribed as it is in other Standards, specifically Standard 18.

R.Brandt asked G.Liggans if he had any comments from the FDA perspective. G.Liggans said it was an excellent question of whether to have this in the standard or as a best practice. It’s definitely advantageous to have a measurement device.

Few additional minutes of discussing the test method versus the reality of what occurs in the field, including some discussion about the food code and how NSF adjusts standards to meet or exceed.

T.Johnson reiterated as issue proponent he doesn’t have any problem either way regarding the requirement of a sensor or not.

M.Kohler suggested it seems appropriate to vote either to accept a probe or not. If the vote is for not requiring a probe, the writing is straightforward. If so, we’ll have to work on wording.

Motion by J.Hipp:  Any remote line set longer than 7.5 feet would require a temperature sensor device
Second: T.Johnson
Further discussion: none
Vote: All in favor
Motion: Carries

R.Brandt then said since this motion carried, let’s discuss voting on the language written by M.Kohler.
T.Johnson said he thought the statement “securely mounted temperature indicating device” was too restrictive, adding a sensor can be securely mounted but technology now allows for the receiving device to be mobile and not affixed to the equipment. J.Hipp thought the statement was indeed just the sensor and M.Kohler confirmed the intent of the language was to secure the sensor.

Motion by T.Johnson: accept the language as written by M.Kohler for section 5.23.2 and send to Task Group to vote.
Second: J.Hipp

Further discussion:

1) M.Kohler confirmed he wrote this language not taking the 7.5 ft barrier in account so it doesn’t include this and will have to be re-written. He also explained how this ties into the performance testing in section 6.0.

2) T.Johnson asked M.Kohler and G.Liggans if this is duly scaled in both Fahrenheit and Celsius. M.Kohler described how it’s testing only in Fahrenheit as today’s processors are very accurate.

3) T.Johnson went on record stating that ± 2.0 °F may end up being too tight of a tolerance.

Vote: All in favor
Motion: Carries

A.Rose said this would be put in ballot form and executed with the task group by the end of the week (11/20). R.Brandt asked that given the holiday he would suggest the vote be carried out through December 12 (21 days total).

R.Brandt told the group that once it’s complete, assuming there were no changes, he would work with A.Rose and M.Kohler for Joint Committee Balloting.

R.Brandt adjourned the meeting

**Action Items:**

1. A.Rose to write M.Kohler’s language into ballot form
2. A.Rose to straw ballot with TG; end on December 12
   a. If it passes TG, prep for JC
   b. If not, discuss changes/options with the TG at the next teleconference on January 6