Task Group on Vending Machines
Teleconference Meeting Summary
December 06, 2016

Participating Members:
Dipak Negandhi (Manitowoc Ice, Inc.)  Jonathan Brania (Underwriters Laboratories)
Jim Collins (Automated Merchandising Systems)  Tony Gagliardi (consultant – public health)
Stephen Schaefer (Hoshizaki America, Inc.)  Tom McNeil (U.S. Army)
Lois Baker (Primo Water Corporation)  Larry Eils (NAMA)
Dale Gallmann (Crane Merchandising Systems)  Girvin Liggans (Food and Drug Administration)

Absent Members:
Bob Corrao (J.M. Smucker Company)  Philip McCrory (Consultant)
Mike Kohler (NSF International)  Tom Conti (Glacier Water)
Tom Johnson (Qlean Tech Enterprises)

Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)  Kelli Fall (NSF International)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
1) Agenda - Vending Machines - TG - 2016-12-06.pdf

Discussion
D.Negandhi was unavailable for the first 20 minutes so A.Rose welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Ten of the 15 voting members were present (67%) representing a quorum. A.Rose then made a call for membership, stating that the Joint Committee for Food Equipment was in need of Public Health Category Representatives and to send interested parties his contact information. L.Eils indicated he had a few people in mind and would share this information with them.

A.Rose confirmed that everyone had received the agenda, and asked if there were any suggested changes; there were none suggested so he called for a motion to accept the agenda.

Motion, Stephen: to accept today’s agenda as written
Second: L.Eils
Discussion: none
Vote: all in favor
Motion: carries

Topic #1 - Scope Straw Ballot 25i10Ar2
A.Rose presented the documents and said this revision 2 ballot had closed with an 11:1:0 vote. He added that D.Negandhi had conferred with the negative voter and that the negative vote was resolved. D.Gallmann was present at this call and confirmed that L.Baker and D.Negandhi had cleared up his no vote and was good with the language.
A. Rose opened the floor for additional comments; there were none. He then confirmed that this language was ready for JC Approval Ballot, but that typically this would be put into a larger ballot with the upcoming other revisions rather than send it off by itself. He asked the group which method they preferred, and it was agreed that the scope language should wait for other language and ballot all at once later. A. Rose confirmed that this language change, however small, would now be the working scope of the Standard. The group agreed.

**Topic #2 – Progress on Sections 300 and 400**

A. Rose prefaced this topic by reminding everyone that this process is not a harmonization in its purest sense. The object of this project is to compare the 2 Standards, and where NSF/ANSI 25 does not cover specifics within NAMA, to write language that will ultimately cover what’s missing.

To that end, that which has already been provided is extensive and there have been a number of ways at tackling the challenge. After examining the various documents, A. Rose suggested that the way K. Fall approached this task may be the most straightforward and logical way for the other sections to be addressed.

K. Fall then explained her process. She worked on Section 400 of NAMA and thought it unnecessary to ‘reinvent the wheel’ on most of this language as Standard 25 (and supporting Standards 12, 51 and 170) already cover most of what NAMA has, and will only require a few tweaks for specifics in NAMA to be incorporated. She then provided the first topic as example one, NAMA language in **BLACK**, NSF Standard Language in **RED**, with language covering the intent of NAMA in **Yellow Highlight**:

**NAMA**

**400.1 General Requirements**

Food contact surfaces and components shall be designed to be easily cleanable and to provide protection of vended foods against contamination.

**NSF 25**

5.1.1 - **Vending machines shall be designed and manufactured to prevent the harborage of vermin and the accumulation of dirt and debris,** and to permit the inspection, maintenance, servicing, and cleaning of the equipment and its components.

5.1.4 - **Food zones shall be readily accessible and easily cleanable,** or shall be designed for in-place cleaning when a readily accessible design is not feasible.

With this example, she confirmed that NAMA is organized by food zones first. NSF doesn’t break up sections this way, but the intent is covered nonetheless. In the end, the 14 page document she submitted covered every subsection of NAMA Section 400.

D. Negandhi had arrived and opened the floor for comments or questions.
L.Eils said this was very good, and agreed this approach would be a great place to start. He added that Section 700 was similar to 400 and asked that since K.Fall had this information fresh in her head, if she wouldn’t mind repeating this with that section. K.Fall said yes and would have this just prior to the next meeting scheduled in February.
D.Negandhi stated we will need to get volunteers for the other sections before today’s meeting was complete.

T.McNeil confirmed he sent in a number of documents as well and that when he looked at this project, he examined it from specific areas, rather than sections of the Standard. what stood out this way was that the water vending language and definitions sections will need to be more completely updated in the NSF standards because they are currently unique to NAMA. D.Negandhi agreed adding that there is a lot of commonality between the standards, but where there is confirmed uniqueness, maybe we should create new subsections.

K.Fall said that with respect to “water and ice”, within NSF this is considered and defined as “food”. Thus, all of the requirements in NSF 25 are “food zones”. She added that, specific language in 25 regarding ice states to “refer to Standard 12. T.McNeil indicated that from the Army’s standpoint, there are many operations where pieces of equipment are combined such that there might be more than one Standard applicable; this is a great inconvenience and this group should consider fixing this.
K.Fall confirmed that the language with which she refers would actually fall under one standard, in this case NSF 25. We simply reference standard 12 if there is an ice machine located inside the vending machine. T.McNeil said that would be suitable.

Do we have a consensus on how to address the ice?
T.McNeil – most of that language came directly from NAMA, very little editing.
D.Negandhi stated that the requirements for ADA, would be another section that is not explicitly in NSF standards.

At this point, D.Negandhi listed off the previous volunteers and called for others to work on the various other sections. The plan would be to return draft language to A.Rose by the middle of February to prep for next meeting:

200 – J.Brania
300 – L.Eils and J.Collins
400 – to be balloted
500 – D.Negandhi
700 – K.Fall
900 – T.McNeil and L.Baker
Group agreed this was enough for now, and will come back to Sections 600 and 800 at a later date.

D.Negandhi asked if there were any other questions; there were none so he thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting.

Action Items:
1) A.Rose to prep and execute Section 400 language for straw ballot with this TG to start by mid December
2) Various sections to be written and sent to A.Rose by each volunteer by E.O.B. February 17, 2017