Task Group on Display Refrigeration
Teleconference Meeting Summary
March 10, 2015

Participating Members:
Bill Sickles (InterMetro Industries Corp)  Joseph Sanders (Traulsen & Co)
Tony Gagliardi (consultant – public health)  Mike Kohler (NSF International)
Dipak Negandhi (Manitowoc Ice, Inc.)  Jon Murray (Structural Concepts Corporation)

Absent Members:
Nick Snyder (Randell Manufacturing)  Larry Howington (ARI/CRMD)

Participating observers:
Jonathan Brania (Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.)  Al Rose (NSF International)
Roger Coffman (Lake County Health Department)  James Petersen (C.i.i. Food Service Design)
Sarah Burton-Zick (DuPage County Health Department)
Anthony Carotenuto (Navy and Marine Corps Public Health Center)
Paul Klouse (Southern Nevada Health District)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
2) FE-2015-2 - Revised Test Conditions, Std 7.pdf
3) Combined 7i10r2 ballot & JC memo.pdf
4) Combined 170i18r1 ballot & JC memo.pdf
5) 170i18r1 JC - Unattended Operation - Results - 02-27-15.pdf
6) 170i18r1 JC - Unattended Operation - Comments - 02-27-15.pdf

Discussion

T.Gagliardi welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Six of the 8 voting members were present (75%) representing a quorum.

T.Gagliardi read off the agenda and acknowledged there was likely more here than could be discussed during the time allotted today.

**Topic #1 – Ballot 170i18r1 – unattended operation**

A.Rose pulled up the ballot, the results and negative comments.

**T.MeNeil’s Comment**
I am not sure the vending and retail industry sees these as limited to packaged foods. I have seen proposals for unpackaged foods which I would believe would include fresh fruits and vegetables and hard boiled eggs. Are these items prohibited elsewhere? Also for other foods does packaged foods imply commercially packaged?
T.McNeil’s Proposal
I would clearly state that potentially hazardous food in unattended locations are limited to commercially packaged foods.

J.Leonard’s Comment
The definition in 3.213 is too restrictive. By limiting to only packaged foods, the document does not account for both existing equipment and new technology currently being developed to dispense both non-potentially hazardous and potentially hazardous food items that are not pre-packaged.

J.Leonard’s Proposal
Remove "packaged" from the definition.

T.Gagliardi read off T.McNeil’s comment and suggested his concern is about not stating specifically a commercial facility, even though it does state a licensed facility.

M.Kohler said this seems to be more from a regulatory requirement. We’re writing this definition for the equipment, not the food, and this definition establishes the zone. He further explained in this application that food could be potentially handled by the customers, so we don’t want unpackaged food. Additionally, there’s already a definition for self-service display refrigerator and read it off:

3.164.4.4 self-service display refrigerator: An open or closed display refrigerator designed for customer access to packaged foods (including unprocessed produce). This term may apply to Type I or Type II display refrigerators.

We’ve used that term for many decades in NSF 7. From our concern as it relates to the equipment itself, the intent is for packaged food. This definition is describing the operation itself.

3.213 unattended operation: (as used in NSF/ANSI 7) A food establishment where consumer access to the facility is controlled, an employee of the establishment may not be readily available, and food offerings are limited to packaged food from a licensed facility.

M.Kohler then commented on J.Leonard’s comments. Said there was some merit, but the definition specifically states NSF/ANSI 7. If we become too restrictive this definition may affect other pieces of equipment for which we are currently unaware.

A.Carotenuto went back to T.McNeil’s comment. Said as a fellow armed forces person he understands where he is coming from. Then asked the group what indeed is a licensed facility. T.Gagliardi provided some examples of what a licensed facility is and an overview of the previous discussions. M.Kohler added to T.Gagliardi’s description by specifying where the food would be coming from, a central commissary. M.Kohler added it would be very limiting for this standard if we make the definition state food only from
A.Carotenuto said he was ok with the current definition and was just trying to supply a rationale of where T.McNeil was coming from.

T.Gagliardi asked D.Negandhi as the content expert if there was a push in the market to supplying unpackaged food. D.Negandhi said essentially what you see in vending machines is what you will see here. He added that T.McNeil’s point might include an unpackaged apple or fruit, but to his knowledge there is no push here. M.Kohler added this is nothing new; we’ve had this in display refrigerators for many years. Uncut fruit is “packaged” in their own skins. We use another term in the definitions having to do with the secondary walk-in coolers, called “food in the original sealed packaged”.

Group then moved into some discussion about J.Leonard’s comment. M.Kohler suggested J.Leonard is looking at this with respect to the overall operation, for instance a coffee machine. M.Kohler added that when we drafted this language we were only thinking about the closed refrigerator. Still don’t think there’s an issue because we are specifically referring to display refrigerators.

T.Gagliardi asked the group if it’s sufficient to say as far as addressing J.Leonard’s comment, this definition is just dealing with Standard 7 equipment. D.Negandhi agreed and added this equipment doesn’t “dispense”. M.Kohler suggested the group may be overcomplicating this. These pieces of equipment already exist in stores, etc. all we’re doing is putting a lock on it with some time/temperature requirements. T.Gagliardi stated that it appears this group believes the definition should remain as is, to which J.Brania agreed and added the scope of this definition has appeared to have expanded and there’s no need for that.

J.Petersen asked if this includes the use of air screen type equipment commonly found in cafeterias that might hold perishables like yogurt. M.Kohler said Standard 7 itself does include this equipment but the scope of this language is for display refrigerators with doors. T.Gagliardi confirmed.

M.Kohler suggested and the group agreed that the current definition was correct and that this task group owes the negative commenters; he offered up the following draft:

To J.Leonard:

This language is specific to NSF 7 and is the only place it’s used is with closed display refrigerators
From the scope of the standard, it’s difficult for us to enforce this as these are local regulations

To T.McNeil:

Same
Action Items:
1) A.Rose to write up draft negative comment letter and share with M.Perez; based on the commenters response, the vote(s) will either both be changed, or the ballot will have to be adjudicated.

**Topic #2 – Ballot 7i10r2 – J.Hipp’s comment regarding Open an Reset Feature**

T.Gagliardi read off the comment to the group:

**J.Hipp’s Comment**

9.7.2 describes a "reset feature". This term is new, undefined and not very informative.

**J.Hipp’s Proposal**

Add a definition and consider calling it a lock-out feature.

**Discussion from February 11, 2014 teleconference**

T.Gagliardi asked group for comments. D.Negandhi commented he looked through 170 and also did not see a definition. Agreed there should be a definition added. Should read to “reset the equipment to its original condition”. Group agreed that developing a definition was the correct thing to do; since this task will be for this task group to develop, T.Gagliardi proposed to the group that they will do this development after this entire list of comments was evaluated. Group Agreed.

M.Kohler read off what was on the ballot:

9.7.2 Time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock shall be equipped with self-closing door(s) and a reset feature that would allow the door to be unlocked only by an operator/employee or service person.

**NOTE – door may not be self-closing when opened greater than 90 degree arc to facilitate servicing.**

M.Kohler added the definition talks about having an automatic door lock with self-closing doors; Joel’s comment to a lock out feature, is already part of this “lock out”. W.Sickles suggested neither term does this process full justice. The group spent about 10 minutes discussing options, including breaking up the sentences, removing various words, and separating thoughts into bullet points. A.Rose made the following changes live with the group using ReadyTalk and the group agreed (*Note: yellow highlights are intended to show updates during this teleconference and will be changed to gray for the ballot*)
9.7.2 Time/temperature-controlled Closed display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock which are intended to be used in unattended locations shall be equipped with:

- an automatic door lock; and
- self-closing door(s); and
- a reset feature that would allow the door to be unlocked only by an operator/employee or service person.

NOTE – door may not be self-closing when opened greater than 90 degree arc to facilitate servicing.

Action Items:
1) A. Rose to share with J. Hipp prior to re-ballot

---

**Topic #3 – Ballot 7i10r2 – B. Sickle’s comment regarding the term “open”**

B. Sickles’s Comment

*Since sliding and hinged doors are covered under the standard, do we need a definition of what "opened" means for the test?*

B. Sickles’s Proposal

*Sliding door is slid completely open. Hinged door is opened 90 degrees.*

Discussion from February 11, 2014 teleconference

D. Negandhi asked M. Kohler if there have ever been any issue on what the “opened” means in the current standard. L. Howington: his meaning there is probably “how far is it open”. He added ASHRE 2 accounts for this. M. Kohler reminded the group that it doesn’t matter for this test because what matters is it above 41 for 30 minutes? **Group agreed language is correct as written**

W. Sickles was on this call and confirmed after the previous discussion he was ok with the current language.
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**Topic #4 – Ballot 7i10r2 – J.Brania’s comment regarding the term “time/temperature”**

**J.Brania’s Comment**

9.7.2 This proposed requirement uses the terminology time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators and freezers.

**J.Brania’s Proposal**

Reword to describe what the equipment will hold. Otherwise, what is a "time" controlled closed display refrigerator or freezer that is intended for unattended use? Its understood that the terminology is somewhat derived from the Food Code (time/temperature control for safety food [formerly PHF]). However, NSF/ANSI 170 uses potentially hazardous foods. This proposal should align with NSF/ANSI 170 or be accompanied by a revision to the glossary (if not already done so).

**Discussion from March 13, 2014 teleconference**

T.Mers suggested his comment was grammatical and added the terminology appears to be taken directly out of the food code. D.Negandhi confirmed he had spoken with J.Brania and said we need to define based on hazardous food classification. T.Mers then confirmed this wording is what’s in the Ohio Food Code. If it’s strictly non-hazardous food this requirement is not needed. **Group agreed to investigate further once the entire comment list was discussed and likely after additional comments came from the JC meeting at the end of March.**

J.Brania was on this call and briefly explained his issue. M.Kohler confirmed he could see where J.Brania was coming from with respect to the food code. M.Kohler added that D.Negandhi and he were looking at the criteria for the display refrigerator and monitoring time/temperature and the door lock. The parameters they were looking at were 41 degrees F for 30 minutes. Didn’t want to use the term “micromarket” in the standard because it’s slang, and may inadvertently also refer to other equipment. J.Brania said it appears then this language was only a happy coincidence regarding the time/temperature. M.Kohler and D.Negandhi confirmed it was.

M.Kohler added he could see where this may cause confusion in the future, to which J.Brania confirmed he was not advocating making new definitions, just seeking clarity. M.Kohler said this was worked out before “unattended operation” definition; once we get passed this we can change the language to remove the term “time/temperature”. J.Brania agreed.

W.Sickles asked the group, in Section 9.7.2, is it possible to have this piece of equipment without a door lock. D.Negandhi answered that the lock out is not required by NSF, but rather by the food code. W.Sickles followed up by suggesting the 9.7.2 language will require to include the “unattended operations” term. The group agreed and A.Rose made all the changes to the original 9.7.2 during the teleconference.

M.Kohler confirmed this goes above and beyond the local food codes and J.Brania agreed with the new wording.
It was determined there were other locations within the ballot where the “unattended operations” wording would need to be updated, specifically 9.13.4 and 9.15 and 9.15.1. A.Rose made the changes with the group during the call, including:

9.13.4 Time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock intended for installation in unattended operations shall have a permanently attached label that states “Evaluated and tested for unattended operations per NSF/ANSI Standard 7”. The label shall be clearly visible to the user after installation of the equipment.

Changed to

9.13.4 Time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock intended for installation in unattended operations which are intended to be used in unattended locations shall have a permanently attached label that states “Evaluated and tested for unattended operations per NSF/ANSI Standard 7”. The label shall be clearly visible to the user after installation of the equipment.

9.15 Performance - Temperature recovery test

The performance requirements in this section apply only to time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock.

9.15.1 Performance requirement

Time/temperature controlled display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock shall require no more than 30 min to restore the air temperature in its food storage compartment to 41 °F (5 °C) or below after having its door open for 15 min.

Changed to

9.15 Performance - Temperature recovery test

The performance requirements in this section apply only to time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators or freezers which are intended to be used in unattended locations.

9.15.1 Performance requirement

Time/temperature controlled closed display refrigerators or freezers with an automatic door lock which are intended to be used in unattended locations shall require no more than 30 min to restore the air temperature in its food storage compartment to 41 °F (5 °C) or below after having its door open for 15 min.
Task Group on Display Refrigeration  
Teleconference Meeting Summary  
March 10, 2015

**Topic #5 – rationale statements**

T.Gagliardi asked the group if rationale statements were needed. M.Kohler said a rationale statement is more important when language is being changed; not as useful for brand new language. It’s already well explained in the cover letter. Group agreed

**Topic #6 – Ballot 7i10r2 – J.Brady’s comment regarding condensing units**

**J.Brady’s Comment**

Standard 7-looking at refrigeration component sections-does it address condensing unit location requirements like Standard 25 Vending machines section 5.24.4? Was this considered for this unattended type application and determined not to be needed?

**J.Brady’s Proposal**

None

Discussion from March 13, 2014 teleconference

D.Negandhi said he spoke with J.Brady about this. He was just commenting that if there was any language from Standard 25 that applies, the group should consider this. Said that J.Brady did not feel strongly about this either way, just wanted to confirm that standard 25 was considered. D.Negandhi further added that this was indeed covered under section 9.11 of Standard 7. L.Howington agreed that standard 7 covers this. Group agreed that the comment was considered and appropriate as written in the ballot.

D.Negandhi said that during this year’s NAFEM we met with J.Brady; confirmed that after the NAFEM show he went back to the task group’s comments and he is specifically talking about the evaporators. M.Kohler said this is again not within the scope of this application; it’s about putting a lock on the door. Standard 7 is already more restrictive in this measure than Standard 25 and read off section 5.24.4 from standard 25. T.Gagliardi reminded the group that this has been discussed in the past and decided this was not a vending machine. M.Kohler provided additional references from section 5 in standard 7 and the group agreed this is already covered.

**Action item**

A.Rose to complete the letter and get back to M.Perez for J.Brady
**Topic #7 – Ballot 7i10r2 – G.Liggin’s comment regarding sections 9.7.2 & 9.16.2**

T.Gagliardi confirmed he met with Girvin and he is ok with the current language. After the JC face to face where a unit was presented, Girvin and T.Gagliardi met and Girvin agreed with the original language.

**Topic #8 – New Issue Paper – FE-2015-2 - Revised Test Conditions, Std 7**

We indicated a new issue paper has been submitted for which this group needs to discuss, and added we are running out of time today. T.Gagliardi made reference to the paper and A.Rose confirmed that it was shared with the group and loaded on the NSF Online Workspace as well.

The issue proponent J.Murray provided a brief statement of his intent. The group agreed to start discussion at the next teleconference scheduled for June 30, 2015.

T.Gagliardi thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.

**Action Items:**

1) *Ballot 170i18r1* - A.Rose to write up draft negative comment letter and share with M.Perez; based on the commenters response, the vote(s) will either both be changed, or the ballot will have to be adjudicated.

2) *Ballot 7i10r2* - A.Rose to share with J.Hipp prior to re-ballot

3) *Ballot 7i10r2* - A.Rose to complete the letters and get back to M.Perez for J.Brady