Task Group on Hot Food Equipment
Teleconference Meeting Summary
August 11, 2020

Participating Members:
Jonathan Brania (UL)       Swati Bhatt (Los Angeles County)
Willard Sickles (InterMetro Industries Corp.)    Tony Gagliardi (Consultant)
Tiffany Curry (Franke Contract Group)     Massoud Neshan (Southern CaseArts)
Timothy Webb (Navy and Marine Corps)     Syed Rizvi (Cornelius, Inc.)

Absent Members:
Mike Kohler (NSF International)     Jeff Differt (Hatco)
Sara Burton-Zick (DuPage County Health Dept.)

Participating observers:
Al Rose (NSF International)      Matt Jenkins (McDonald’s Corp)
Kaylyn Brunskole (NSF International)    Giorgio Beretta (Anima)
Thomas Jumalon (North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services)

Supplemental Materials Referenced
1) Agenda - Hot Food Equipment - TG - 2020-08-12.pdf
2) 4i25r3 - FWE 5.48 Exemption - Straw Ballot.docx
3) 4i25r2 - FWE 5.48 Exemption - Ballot COMMENTS.pdf
4) 4i28r4 - Tubing in Cappuccino Machines - Ballot.docx
5) 4i28r3 - Tubing in Cappuccino Machines - straw ballot COMMENTS.pdf

Discussion
J.Brania welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. 8 of the 11 voting members were present (73%) representing a quorum. A.Rose indicated the second and third items on the agenda were very straightforward and suggested the group begin with these first before going back to continue discussion on the first agenda item. The group agreed.

**Topic #1 – Issue 28 – Tubing in Cappuccino Machines**
A.Rose recapped that Revision 2 passed the JC unanimously and was sent to the CPHC, where a negative vote and comment was collected. Since that time, the negative commenter and issue proponent met to discuss, and the language was further revised for clarity. These 2 parties also met with the TG Chair and JC Chair for additional discussion, with the resulting revision 3 ballot being sent to this TG where another negative vote comment was received.

T.Gagliardi was the negative commenter and briefly explained his position, specifically that the word ‘or’ should be replaced with ‘and’ because both conditions are essential:

Original proposal

— designed so that it is completely gravity self-drained of milk between dispenses, or is designed to be completely and automatically flushed to waste with potable water or fresh temperature-controlled milk at intervals not exceeding 4 h;
Revision 3 straw ballot proposal

— designed so that it is completely gravity self-drained of milk between dispenses and is designed to be completely and automatically flushed to waste with potable water or fresh temperature-controlled milk at intervals not exceeding 4 h;

J.Brania opened the floor for comments; there were none and the following motion was put to the floor:

**Motion, S.Rizvi**: send proposed language to the JC as an approval ballot

**Second**: S.Bhatt

**Discussion**: none

**Vote**: 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

**Motion**: carries

**Action item: send to JC approval ballot**

---

**Topic #2 – Issue 25 – Food Warming Equipment in 5.48**

J.Brania explained the background of the issue. A.Rose added that Revision 1 passed TG straw ballot and JC Approval ballot but received 1 negative vote and comment from the CPHC. The comment was straightforward and sent back to JC as revision 2 which was unanimously and positively received however a couple affirmative comments suggested the sentences be pulled apart and located in different sections:

**5.48 Food warming equipment**

Food warming equipment intended solely for the display of foods that are not potentially hazardous shall have a permanently attached label that states: "Not for the storage or display of potentially hazardous foods." The label shall be clearly visible to the user after installation of the equipment. The testing in Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.7 does not apply to food warming equipment intended solely for the display of foods that do not require temperature control for safety.

J.Brania confirmed that in most of the NSF standards, this type of text would show up as a first statement (previously as a NOTE) in each relevant sub-section. He then opened the floor for comment.

T.Jumalon asked if the language about ‘potentially hazardous’ was going to be changed to ‘temperature control for safety’. A.Rose explained the work being done in another TG and that indeed this would be changed.

J.Brania then explained what each section of any Standard is, specifically section 1 is Scope, section 2 is Normative References, etc. and D.Negandhi suggestion is to move this language to section 6 which is the Performance Requirements section, rather than putting this new language in Section 5 which is the design and construction section. A.Rose presented this in ballot form:
6 Performance

6.1.X The testing does not apply to food warming equipment intended solely for the display of foods that do not require temperature control for safety.

6.2.X The testing does not apply to food warming equipment intended solely for the display of foods that do not require temperature control for safety.

6.7.X The testing does not apply to food warming equipment intended solely for the display of foods that do not require temperature control for safety.

J.Bania made two suggestions for clarity and opened the floor up for comment:

6.1.X The testing This test does not apply to food warming equipment intended solely for the display of foods that do not require temperature control for safety as detailed in 5.48.

There were no comments, so he presented the other comment from B.Glynn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glynn, Beth - Starbucks Coffee Company</th>
<th>Reflection of the equipment use limitation (&quot;Not for the storage or display of potentially hazardous foods&quot;) in the online equipment listing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How will the equipment use limitation (&quot;Not for the storage or display of potentially hazardous foods&quot;) be reflected in the online equipment listing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K.Brunskole confirmed this was a certification policy and not a standard issue.

There were no other comments and the following motion was put to the floor:

**Motion, B.Sickles** Send proposed language to the JC as an approval ballot
**Second:** S.Bhatt
**Discussion:** none
**Vote:** 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions
**Motion:** carries

**Action item: send to JC approval ballot**
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**Topic #3 – Issue 21 – Open Heated Merchandisers**

J.Brania explained the long history and discussion on this topic, and A.Rose added details about the ballot history specifically that R5 and R6 Straw Ballot Results and comments have been extensively discussed already by this TG, and during the last call with time running out the group decided to pick up the remaining comment discussion during this call.

J.Brania confirmed the issue proponent (Jeff Differt) not on the call today, and this may be an issue for discussion, but the group should attempt anyway. He added that during the last straw ballot Jim Brady, now retired from the JC, also presented a complete list of packaging products, and the TG discussed and revised the language, after which the Issue Proponent voted no:

### 5.49 Open heated merchandisers

5.49.1 Open heated merchandisers designed to operate in a reduced energy mode shall be constructed with an indicator to signify when the equipment is operating in the reduced energy mode. An indicator shall be provided for each independently heated zone that is visible to the user upon installation of the equipment. All indicators shall be clearly visible to the user after installation of the equipment.

5.49.2 Open heated merchandisers capable of operating in a reduced energy mode using sensors to detect the presence of a food load, shall indicate where food must be placed during operation.

5.49.3 Open heated merchandisers capable of operating in a reduced energy mode using sensors to detect the presence of a food load, shall have a permanent, heat-resistant label stating that only packaging that consistently engages the sensor(s) shall be used on this equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differt, Jeff - Hatco Corp.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.49.2 and 5.49.3 - If the unit is marked where food is to be placed, then why must an additional permanent, heat-resistant label stating that only packaging that consistently engages the sensor(s) shall be used on this equipment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8.2.1 - Why should test media be prepared, when if applicable, simply using the media containers would produce passing results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J.Brania opened the floor for comments.

B.Sickles confirmed he has no objections with the proposal.

J.Brania suggested the group make the proposed revisions live here and see what it looks like. The first is to remove 5.49.3 because if the unit is already marked where the food is to be placed, why does it also need a permanent sticker:
5.49.3 Open heated merchandisers capable of operating in a reduced energy mode using sensors to detect the presence of a food load, shall have a permanent, heat-resistant label stating that only packaging that consistently engages the sensor(s) shall be used on this equipment.

T.Gagliardi asked whether there is known packaging that would fail to engage the sensor. None was noted by the participants. J.Brania indicated the intent of the language is geared less toward the positioning issue, and this led to discussion of how regulators would confirm food safety in the field. This is a two-fold process whereby they first measure the temperature of the food, then if needed, find out if the equipment is being used properly. T.Jumalon suggested there are some jurisdictions where inspectors are only looking at hot or cold food, then some that are looking at equipment as well.

Tim confirmed that many of the units used within his operations include additional measuring devices within each unit, for instance an additional thermometer within the cabinet of a refrigerator. S.Bhatt agreed adding that the primary focus is the temperature of the food, and secondarily the operation of the equipment.

J.Brania asked the group after this discussion whether there is support to remove 5.49.3.

B.Sickles postulated that since these merchandisers are dependent on sensor engagement, and nobody has been able to determine what kind of packaging could defeat the sensor, are we trying to address a problem that doesn’t exist. He added that the rationale for deletion of 5.49.3 would be there is no evidence of any packaging that will defeat this equipment.

Group decided to send this back to straw ballot with the task group with 5.49.3 deleted.

J.Brania then presented the second part of the comment, specifically why is the dough mixture needed to begin with. Ultimately if the empty packaging is sufficient to demonstrate conformity with the requirement, then it would not be necessary to prepare the food analogue for the test. The group agreed.

With time running out, A.Rose indicated he would discuss a language update with M.Kohler and present revision 7 to this TG as a straw ballot.

There was a very short discussion about setting up the next meeting and A.Rose confirmed he would send out a doodle poll for another meeting during Q4 2020.

Meeting adjourned