Tab F8 – New Issue Paper FE-2018-14 – ICP Changed to CIP
M.Kohler is the issue proponent and presented his paper and supporting documents, explaining the background related to the Conference for Food Protection (CFP).

FE-2018-14 - ICP changed to CIP, including support documents.pdf

M.Perez opened the floor for comments

Motion by T.Johnson: Send this language to the TG on Food Equipment Materials

Second: J.Brady

Discussion: T.Johnson suggested it’s important to understand that CIP is a subset of IPC, IPC is visual and CIP is not. This JC should be careful not to get rid of the concept of IPC. M.Kohler confirmed the intent here is generally to change many of these used terms to CIP, but there will be places where manual IPC is needed. T.Johnson further explained the difference of CIP versus IPC, mainly that CIP is a plumbed process and IPC is not. There was various questions about the semantics of the terms and the following example seemed to clear this up. A large mixing bowl, too heavy to move easily, receives manual IPC (In-Place-Cleaning), whereas soft serve ice cream equipment, which has inaccessible internal parts is plumbed and cleaned using CIP (Clean-In-Place).

Vote: Twenty-seven in favor, Zero Opposed, Zero Abstentions

Motion: Carries

Action item: A.Rose to send to TG on Food Equipment Fabrication

Tab H – Other New Business
Per the motion on day 1 regarding the possible new agenda items, M.Perez confirmed that B.Glynn had submitted 2 new issue papers and is ready to present them here today. B.Glynn explained the background for both was with respect to comments she provided on the retiring of Standard 36 – dinnerware. The intent for which is to discuss what if any specifics in 36 should be updated into Standard 2.
Tab H1 – New Issue Paper FE-2018-17 – Glass in Food Zone

B. Glynn presented her issue paper and supporting documents, explaining this first paper is for incorporating test protocols for types of breakable dinnerware.

**FE-2018-17 - Glass in Food Zone.pdf**

**Motion by T. Johnson:** Send this to the TG on Food Equipment Fabrication

**Second:** S. Schaefer

**Discussion:** T. Johnson asked if there currently an impact test for dinnerware, and if not should one be created. B. Glynn explained what they do at Starbucks, and the thought for developing specific methods for testing in Standard 2. The problem now is that there is no consistent method so we’ve cobbled together various methods used elsewhere.

B. Corrao asked how this relates to health and safety, and B. Glynn said there is a potential for breakage close to ice bins, so dinnerware needs to be durable. M. Kohler confirmed there currently are no ceramic glassware standards in the FE suite, however some time back he put in an Issue Paper to include glassware. At that time the JC refused. J. Brady called up and read off the IP submitted by M. Kohler in 2000.

**Excerpt: Standard 36—Dinnerware**

Mike Kohler (NSF International) gave an overview of the scope of the current Standard 36. There is a note in the Standard regarding the exclusion of glassware. He asked the Joint Committee if the scope should be expanded to include chinaware and glassware.

M. Elliot thought there might be a concern about the glazes used in making the chinaware and glassware. K. Northcutt asked if flatware is or could be included in Standard 36 as well. M. Whybark replied that flatware is covered by Standard 2. Mr. Perez then asked why glassware and chinaware were excluded from Standard 36. To which M. Whybark replied that those items had been excluded because they could not pass the impact test.

M. Kohler added that there is now glassware available which is capable of driving nails into two by fours. M. Schwartz questioned why regulators have not expressed a need for this. J. Hipp expressed concern that if we included these items to be covered by that standard that only new glassware might be able to meet the standard. Mr. Schwartz viewed it as an effort from manufacturers to try to get the NSF Mark for marketing purposes.

Jim Brady stated that he would feel safer if glassware had some type of testing. **Mr. Schwartz made a motion that NSF should stay away from adding glassware and chinaware to Standard 36 unless there is a request from the regulatory sector to add it to the standard.** The motion...
carried. Glassware and chinaware will not be added to Standard 36 unless a need from the regulatory sector is later expressed.

T. Jumalon then asked what the purpose would be for adding this to Standard 2. B. Glynn said she is hearing from manufacturers that NSF does not require testing, and it would be easier for her as a user if there was somewhere to point to for testing. M. Samarya-Timm indicated that as a regulator and user of the ceramic cups, she sees value in updating the performance testing to include this, adding it would set the bar above and beyond the food code. T. Jumalon said he doesn’t see how putting something in a standard gives any power to regulators. The ownership needs to be placed on the users. B. Glynn provided an example of lead in dishware and how some years back that was not surprising to find lead in wine glasses. J. Murray suggested this sounds like a quality measurement, not public safety. J. Leonard.

**Vote:** Twenty-four in favor, Three Opposed, Zero Abstentions

**Motion:** Carries

**Action item:** A. Rose to send to TG on Food Equipment Fabrication

---


B. Glynn presented her issue paper and supporting documents, explaining this second paper is regarding the terms dinnerware and tableware.


**Motion by T. Johnson:** Send this to the TG on Food Equipment Fabrication

**Second:** J. Scanlon

**Discussion:** J. Hipp indicated that tableware is not defined in 170, so we’ll have to develop that as well. M. Kohler confirmed that tableware was in the Food Code and includes flatware, so we may have to keep that in mind as well.

**Vote:** Twenty-five in favor, Zero Opposed, Two Abstentions

**Motion:** Carries

**Action item:** A. Rose to send to TG on Food Equipment Fabrication