

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
October 3, 2017**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Participating Members:

Jim Brady (Wawa, Inc.)
Willard Sickles (InterMetro Industries Corp)
Paul Klouse (Southern Nevada Health District)
Tiffany Curry (Franke Contract Group)
Girvin Liggans (Food and Drug Administration)
Dipak Negandhi (Manitowoc Foodservice)

Mike Kohler (NSF International)
Tom McNeil (U.S. Army)
Swati Bhatt (Los Angeles County)
Bob Kuhn (Carlisle)
Tony Gagliardi (Consultant – PH)
Millicent Crenshaw (Cambro)

Absent Members:

Burl Finkelstein (Kason Industries)
Joshua Spencer (Stone Spectrum)
Theodore Barber (Theodore Barber & Company)
Gilad Gabby (MDPH/BEH Food Protection Agency)

Roger Coffman (Consultant – PH)
Gary Maxon (The Delfield Co)
Michael Perez (Baring Industries)
Pierre Clemons (Cambro)

Participating observers:

Al Rose (NSF International)

Kelli Fall (NSF International)

Supplemental Materials Referenced

- 1) [Agenda - FEF - TG - 2017-10-03 - published draft.pdf](#)
- 2) [FE-2017-12 - Update 2 regarding Dinnerware .pdf](#)
- 3) [36i7r1 Ballot Comments; 07-08-2017.pdf](#)
- 4) [2017 1003 Agenda Supplemental Information.pdf](#)
- 5) [Approval of 36i7r1 - withdrawal of NSF ANSI 36 APPROVAL - COMMENTS.pdf](#)

Discussion

J.Brady welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Eleven of the 19 voting members were present (58%) which represented a quorum. J.Brady read off agenda and asked if any other items to be added or changed. There were no suggestions and he began the meeting.

He confirmed there were three items on agenda and listed them, suggesting they be addressed in order.

Topic #1 – Incorporating Standard 36 (Dinnerware) into Standard 2 – new issue paper FE0-2017-12

J.Brady said this was submitted for discussion during the recent Joint Committee Face to Face, and asked the members of the Standard 36 TG and for M.Kohler to provide historical perspective

M.Kohler indicated this goes back many years with respect to the testing of dinnerware. The Standard was created mostly due to the relatively new plastic items, which had many similar design requirements for other products and for measuring toxicology. He added that there is performance testing referred to as durability testing, in Standard 51, then explained the process of the durability test including temperature exposures and knife test for scratching.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
October 3, 2017**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

After conducting the durability test, the items are subject to the cleanability test from 51. This test has now reached the point where it is problematic. The apparatus required and ingredients used (radioactive) make the ability to conduct this test impractical.

This information was presented to the JC and they suggested coming up with a new test. A separate group internal to NSF worked under 51 TG and developed a new test. This new method does not use radioactive material anymore but rather a chemical extraction. This method is still quite elaborate however so the group decided it was a good time to present the method to manufacturers of the finished product, and other stakeholders. The intention was to first find out if there were any other methods out in the industry.

Through the course of these discussions, it was discovered there are other materials already certified to Standard 2 that do not have a requirement of the durability test, even though they are made of similar materials and used in a similar manner, so the group asked “why is Standard 36 needed”. Conclusion from task group was to decide whether we do without this requirement, eliminate Standard 36 and apply standard 2 certification. An approval ballot executed, with one negative comment:

Comment Submitted by James Leonard, MPH, LEHP 2017-07-10 15:25:20	By withdrawing the standards of NSF/ANSI 36 without carrying them over to NSF/ANSI 2, dinnerware will be held to a lower standard than currently outlined in NSF/ANSI 36.
Submitter Proposed Solution	I suggest the TG review the testing parameters and consider applying them more broadly to NSF/ANSI 2 or retain them within NSF/ANSI 36.

B.Kuhn added additional perspective, in that the comments from this ballot were already discussed with the TG agreeing and voting (via straw ballot) to have removed, and there were no negatives including members from the Public Health community.

J.Brady said that in addition to the negative comment, there was a non-voting member comment uploaded during the ballot, which lead him to submit the issue paper on this subject to garner additional discussion with the Task Group on Standard 2 (Food Equipment Fabrication). All of this information is presented here in the supplemental document:

[2017 1003 Agenda Supplemental Information.pdf](#)

J.Brady opened the floor for comments, asking if there were any other questions about our task moving forward. T.McNeil asked if the specific performance tests currently in Standard 36 will go into Standard 2, to which J.Brady indicated that will be part of the discussion and began by presenting the negative comment from the ballot:

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
October 3, 2017**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Negative Vote Comment Submitted by James Leonard, MPH, LEHP

By withdrawing the standards of NSF/ANSI 36 without carrying them over to NSF/ANSI 2, dinnerware will be held to a lower standard than currently outlined in NSF/ANSI 36.

Submitter Proposed Solution

I suggest the TG review the testing parameters and consider applying them more broadly to NSF/ANSI 2 or retain them within NSF/ANSI 36.

J.Brady added in J.Leonard's absence he seems to be asking for a review of the testing parameters to hold the dinnerware to a consistent standard (all listed within standards 36, 2 and 51).

He finished by opening the question: *what as a group do we believe should be added to Standard 2 if anything is needed at all?*

M.Kohler and B.Kuhn confirmed, the Dinnerware TG was brought together to discuss this very question, and in fact after a few teleconferences and a straw ballot determined that everything already necessary for Dinnerware was located in Standard 2, and that no performance testing was required to be moved over. M.Kohler said the group also discussed adding the word 'dinnerware' to the scope of Standard 2, but generally agreed it would be nice to add, but did not need to be added.

Then, addressing the negative comment, M.Kohler concluded it was vague and B.Kuhn suggested again that the TG could not find any reason to continue this test, including the public health members.

J.Brady asked the group if there is anyone here that feels any items from standard 36 be put into 2; there were no additional comments.

J.Brady asked A.Rose to explain the process moving forward, and he confirmed the next step would be to write a negative response letter and reach out to the negative commenter.

Action item

J.Brady to construct Negative Response Letter and share with JC Chair for sending to J.Leonard

The group turned to the comment from M.Perez, specifically whether the term dinnerware should be added to the scope and if so, where. M.Kohler and B.Kuhn confirmed the dinnerware TG discussed this and agreed it was nice to have, but not necessary. B.Sickles suggested that if standard 36 is withdrawn, it deserves mention in the scope of 2 if for no other reason than to indicate in the future where Standard 36 had gone. J.Brady turned to his issue document language for the scope statement:

Scope (Brady Issue Document)

Equipment covered by this Standard includes, but is not limited to, bakery, cafeteria, kitchen, and pantry units and other food handling and processing equipment such as tables and components, counters, dinnerware, hoods, shelves, and sinks

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
October 3, 2017**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

The group agreed this should be balloted.

Action Item:

Straw Ballot for this to be sent to this TG

Issue 2 from M.Perez, compare what is currently in 5.5 of Standard 36 with 5.57.2 currently in Standard 2 to make sure Standard 2 adequately covers dinnerware:

5.5 Shape and size

Dinnerware products shall be manufactured so that their shape and size permit cleaning and sanitizing of all surfaces when properly racked and washed in a commercial spray-type dishwashing machine. Their shape shall also permit draining of wet surfaces when properly racked.

Standard 2:

5.57.2 Cleaning (automatic)

If equipment is to be subjected to automatic cleaning methods, horizontal projections and other obstacles that prevent self-draining shall be eliminated. Manufacturer's recommendations for cleaning and maintenance shall be provided.

J.Brady asked question to group: *is there a need to carry this over into 2?*

B.Kuhn said no and M.Kohler agreed, adding the cleaning requirements are typically by hand, the premise being if it can be cleaned by hand it can be cleaned in a washer. He further suggested that the statement is subjective because what is '*properly racked*'. The dinnerware TG thought this current statement may be doing more harm than good. B.Kuhn finished by stating that cleanability is already in standard 51 for ALL materials, so there's no need to call out dinnerware

J.Brady said this group sounds like this shouldn't be added to Standard 2 and asked for additional comments; there were none

The next point from M.Perez's comments was with Section 5.61

5.61 Dinnerware

5.61.1 Shape and size

5.61.2 Identification mark

Dinnerware shall have a permanent marking or an identification plate that denotes the manufacturer's name and product model number. If the manufacturer has more than one production location for the dinnerware product, then the production location shall be identified on the marking or identification plate.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
October 3, 2017**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Rationale: Even though NSF Certification has a policy requiring manufacturer and product identification on dinnerware, other certifiers may not have such a policy. If marking is important, the requirement should be in the standard.

Questions:

1. *Should this criterion be carried over from standard 36?*
2. *If yes, where should it go? 5.60 or new section 5.61 and 5.61.2 or elsewhere?*

J.Brady opened the floor for comments.

B.Kuhn suggested this is already under certification policies, and M.Kohler confirmed this was an item not discussed during the dinnerware TG meetings. M.Kohler added that this is indeed covered because products have to be identified, but the real question is if this group thinks this should be added to the dinnerware standard then what about all the items already in standard 2 that don't have this. A short discussion ensued about the redundancy of this language.

J.Brady said this group sounds like this shouldn't be added to Standard 2 and asked for additional comments; there were none

J.Brady asked if there was any other discussion regarding the withdrawal of Standard 36 and incorporation into Standard 2; there was none

Topic #2 – G.Liggans's issue regarding Paragraph versus Bulleted formatting

J.Brady presented G.Liggans's comment, and an example:

Paragraph example from Standard 4

5.2.1.1 Lesser radii may be used where necessary to ensure the proper functioning of parts (e.g., sealing ring grooves or precision operating parts) provided that they are easily cleanable

Bullet example Standard 2

5.2.1.3 Lesser radii may be used only when necessary to ensure proper functioning of parts such as

- sealing ring grooves
- precision operating parts

provided they are easily cleanable.

G.Liggans's reasoning

5.2.1.3 - The phrase "provided they are easily cleanable" in section appears awkwardly placed and could cause some confusion as to what is to be easily cleanable. As is, 5.2.1.3 is explicitly setting a requirement for lesser radii and implicitly setting a requirement for sealing ring grooves and precision operating parts. If there is a desire to have both sealing ring grooves and precision operating parts to be "easily cleanable" and it isn't already covered in this or another standard we should consider either adding a standalone sentence explicitly saying "sealing ring grooves and precision operating parts shall be easily cleanable" in this or the most appropriate standard or simply dropping the phrase completely from the proposed language.

**Task Group on Food Equipment Fabrication
Teleconference Meeting Summary
October 3, 2017**

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

G.Liggans's Recommendation

If there is a desire to have both sealing ring grooves and precision operating parts to be "easily cleanable" and it isn't already covered in this or another standard we should consider either adding a standalone sentence explicitly saying "sealing ring grooves and precision operating parts shall be easily cleanable" in this or the most appropriate standard or simply dropping the phrase completely from the proposed language.

M.Kohler and B.Sickles confirmed this item was discussed during the TG chairs meeting at the Joint Committee Face to Face in August. The group agreed at the time they don't want to get carried away and bullet everything, but the group agreed bullets are better.

A.Rose reminded the group an issue paper is necessary to move on this specific item; T.Gagliardi agreed to write up an issue paper

Action Item:

T.Gagliardi to write up issue paper.

Topic #3 – J.Hipp's added reference

J.Brady explained J.Hipp's unrelated comment during the sealant ballot, specifically that there is a missing reference to section 5.34. J.Brady presented J.Hipp's proposed revision:

4.7 Sealants

Sealants shall meet the requirements for the zone of intended use and shall only be used as permitted in 5.4.4, ~~and 5.5.2.~~ **and 5.34.**

Including his rationale:

(newly referenced item) 5.34 Ice pans and bins

Joints and seams in ice pans and bins shall be sealed and smooth. Solder and other sealants may be used for sealing structurally sound seams. All internal angles shall have a minimum radius of 1/8 in (0.13 in, 3.2 mm). Solder may be used to effect a required radius.

B.Kuhn asked the group to consider if there was a solid reason why this was left out of the language originally. M.Kohler confirmed the original thought is it was already covered in 5.4.4, adding there is no harm in J.Hipp's thoughts, but because it is already a seam, it's technically covered.

B.Kuhn suggested this be sent to straw ballot and the group agreed.

Action Item:

Straw Ballot for this to be sent to this TG

J.Brady asked if there were any other comments. There were none and the meeting was adjourned.