Participating Members:
Dipak Negandhi (Manitowoc Ice, Inc.)
Jim Collins (Automated Merchandising Systems)
Dale Gallmann (Crane Merchandising Systems)
Bryan Laird (Primo Water Corporation)
Jonathan Brania (Underwriters Laboratories)
Girvin Liggans (Food and Drug Administration)
Bob Corrao (J.M. Smucker Company)
Larry Eils (NAMA)
Kelli Fall (NSF International)
Tom Johnson (Qlean Tech Enterprises)
Stephen Schaefer (Hoshizaki America, Inc.)

Absent Members:
Tony Gagliardi (consultant – public health)
Tom Conti (Glacier Water)

Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
2) Section 300 Gap Checklist.docx
3) Section 400 Gap Checklist.docx

Discussion
D.Negandhi welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Eleven of the 15 voting members were present (73%) representing a quorum.

Dipak briefly recapped the large amount of work completed over the last year, thanking everyone for the great effort and indicated we would now be moving on to the next phase of language development beyond the gap analysis. He confirmed that K.Fall had taken the gap analysis specifically for Sections 300 and 400, and wrote up checklists to discuss integration of the two Standards during this meeting today. D.Negandhi added that this group does not need to develop exact language here today, but rather to overview the process of integrating all the sections of the NAMA eventually into Standard 25.

The end result of the meeting today will be discussion of the 2 sections, but equally important will be work on the other sections followed by straw ballots prior to the next teleconference. The group agree on this approach.

Topic #1 – Section 300 Gap Checklist
Section 300 Gap Checklist.docx

Gap 1 – Spacing of doors and specifications for preventing moisture and dust entry

D.Negandhi indicated that NAMA specifically states what is allowed for closed locked doors, etc. K.Fall asked if the intent of the NAMA standard to address all vending doors, or only doors in the vending stage. L.Eils confirmed it’s the entire front door, and K.Fall suggested this would be an example of a gap
in the Standards. She thus proposed updating 5.8.1 to include NAMA intent language. T.Johnson asked if this applies to ice vending, and L.Eils confirmed it does; it includes any door on a unit. K.Fall suggested Section 5.1.1 of Standard 25 already covers this:

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.

There was a bit of discussion regarding the 1/16 of an inch gap in the language and T.Johnson suggested the group update this language as well. To this K.Fall reminded the group that any discussion about updating language not specifically designed to cover the gap between the standards is a separate issue, outside the scope of this issue paper. The group agreed.

Gap 2 – self-closing door exception

L.Eils explained the definition of ‘vending stage’, as delivering a product to the customer. This language was added some time back because of the requirements local to California and Arizona. Specifically they learned that the doors on machines were usually broken very quickly, thus we still needed protection. Brief discussion about water vending as a splash zone

K.Fall said that NAMA specifically states if an area is designed with a mechanism to make it inaccessible, then it’s not ‘vending’. Standard 25 does not currently spell out that exemption. If we receive a piece of equipment that has this feature, we wouldn’t call it out because it meets the intent of standard 25 already. So the question is, do we need to include a version of this language in Standard 25. L.Eils and T.Johnson both suggested this is a very specific exemption and important to regulators. K.Fall agreed it doesn’t change anything already with 25, so adding this language won’t be an issue.

K.Fall read off current language in Section 5.26.2 of 25 and suggested this new language be updated here; group agreed

Gap 3 – Stay open position on self-closing doors for unattended locations

Brief discussion about the self-closing feature, and L.Eils confirmed this language does not need to be considered because it was added to cover what was added to standard 7 recently.

Group agreed
Gap 4 - Screen size for continuous forced draft exhaust openings, and compressor compartments

K.Fall explained that 25 has ventilation openings represented in a general manner:

5.16.2 Screens used on ventilation openings into food and container storage shall be at least 16 mesh (minimum 16 strands per 1 in [25 mm]), or equivalent. Screens of at least 8 mesh (minimum 8 stands per 1 in [25 mm]), or equivalent, shall be used on openings to areas housing condensing units.

5.33.3 Drains that do not terminate in closed areas shall be protected from the entrance of vermin by a 16 mesh (minimum 16 strands per 1 in [25 mm]) screen or effective trap. Screens shall be removable for cleaning.

The NAMA standard is again specific, so should something be added to 25.

T.Johnson asked L.Eils what the rationale is between 12 mesh and 16 mesh, and L.Eils confirmed primarily to keep out mice, not insects.

Few minutes of discussion about the different sized meshes described in each standard (4, 12, 16), and whether to update NSF to account for this, confirming that NSF 25 is already the most stringent 16.

B.Corrao indicated that writing it up to 16 mesh is a move in the right direction; it harmonizes all the parts of the machine and is most stringent. Group agreed.

Gap 5 – Shipping bolt holes

L.Eils suggested this too is also already in Standard 25. K.Fall added the reason she wrote it up here was that 25 doesn’t require it to be in the service manual. Brief discussion with the group agreeing it does not need further consideration and don’t need to change 25.

Gap 6 – Miscellaneous opening/closures

K.Fall suggested this is the same as gap 5, whereby there is no requirement to this being in the service manual. Group agreed, with the same response to consideration in 25.

Gap 7 – Side panel channel closures

K.Fall said the question here is that the NAMA standard does not specify levels, and thus it’s not clear whether the term ‘levelers’ in 25 should be removed to be more general. Her suggestion was to amend and remove the term from 25. Group agreed there is no particular reason to be specific and term can be removed.
Gap 8 – Kick Plate

K.Fall indicated the NAMA standard provides the option of be removing the kick plate, whereas standard 25 requires it. B.Corrao read off both statements for clarity to the group. D.Negandhi suggested they are really saying the same thing, and L.Eils confirmed the intent in NAMA is to be able to be cleaned without the need of opening the door. K.Fall said the NAMA standard is more stringent in this case and suggested changing 5.19.5 to be more stringent. Group agreed to change this section as well.

D.Negandhi confirmed that was all the gaps in Section 300, and asked the group if there were any more comments.

Motion, T.Johnson: to send each to straw ballot as discussed today
Second: B.Corrao
Discussion: none
Vote: All in favor
Motion: Carries

Action items
1) K.Fall to rewrite language based on today’s discussion
2) A.Rose to send to straw ballot with this group prior to next teleconference

With some time left in the meeting, D.Negandhi suggested the group discuss section 400 as well

Topic #2 – Section 400 Gap Checklist

Gap 1 – Food contact material finish

L.Eils suggested highlighted section is already in 25 or 51:

Paint, enamel and similar substances shall not be used as a finish on food contact surfaces

B.Corrao agreed adding that NSF is very comprehensive here so let’s do nothing with this; group agreed

Gap 2 – Water and melt water tubing in the icemaker system

K.Fall suggested the difference in the two standards here is semantics. NSF 25 does not specifically state removal like NAMA, but in 25 tubing must be ‘accessible and cleanable’, which means the same thing. If the group does want to update the language in 25 however, to be clear cleanability is already stated, so only a statement regarding removability would need to be added.
T.Johnson suggested this change should be made in order to recognize the importance tubing removal, and K.Fall agreed as long as we don’t go outside the scope of the issue paper. In this case, she suggested adding a new section to standard 12 rather than 25 as this would trump standard 25 and meet both 12 and 25:

**Section 5.31 (Standard 12)**
All water and melt water tubing in the ice-making system shall be removable.

J.Collins asked for clarity regarding the definition of removable; A.Rose presented the following from 170:

3.172 **removable**: Capable of being detached and taken away from the parent unit, and reattached to the parent unit with the use of simple tools.

Group agreed on course of action

**Gap 3 – water filter location**

K.Fall confirmed standard 25 does not currently address the location of the water filters. Depending on the intent in NAMA, we may have to update the language in 25, continuing that for 25 if water flowing through is potable, it must be readily accessible and cleanable, or covered by ICP. K.Fall added it would be easy enough to simply add the wording directly from NAMA, except there will definitely be questions about what is meant by ‘sufficient distance’.

Some discussion about what is meant by both the phrases ‘sufficient distance’ and ‘sanitary replacement’, with the common interpretation of each, with the group agreeing there is no need of a new definition.

**Gap 4 – ice bagging system fans**

K.Fall confirmed 25 has no requirement for using a filter on a fan, however, if there is a fan blowing directly into the bag or chute, it would be in a food zone. So even if the language isn’t specifically there, it’s already addressed. If this group agrees specificity is needed however, we can add language that is similar to NAMA. Since we don’t have a specific section, we will have to create one. B.Corrao suggested new language would be helpful, adding that the ‘dispensing section’ would be a great location for the new statement. The group agreed.

D.Negandhi indicated this was the last gap in section 400 and asked if there were any further comments; there were none.

A.Rose confirmed these sections would be sent to straw ballot with this group in the weeks ahead, and depending on feedback, other sections may be sent to similar ballot prior to setting up another meeting.
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Motion, T.Johnson: to adjourn
Second: L.Eils
Discussion: none
Vote: All in favor
Motion: Carries