IV New Business

Discussion of annex F and G

R. Powitz asked the Committee if annex F and G should be separated from the standard and become stand-alone standards for certification processes. F. Spevak stated that the motivation for an ASHRAE research project was a disagreement between testing and certifiers. The certifiers stated that the testing part was not a standard. At ASHRAE, the discussion was that if NSF did not separate the annexes as a separate standard, then ASHRAE would come up with one. D. Phillips stated that there is a prestige to the name of NSF/ANSI 49. W. Peters suggested that this would be lost as a stand-alone annex and asked if it is not possible to be attached to 49 in some way. T. Bruursema added that there is no precedence of attaching or maintaining numbering so standards are related, although that it is an option. D. Phillips wondered if it is possible to keep the name as NSF 49 for cabinet definitions and NSF 49 for certification. It was also noted that annex F is a normative section of the standard. J. Wagner stated other groups are already referencing 49; therefore, if a change was made, it would cause other standards to change references.

R. Powitz added the Committee does not have very many true users of biosafety cabinetry and that they should make up a larger part to keep balance. He continued that certification has been very substantive in recent time and is part of the industry. The complexity of certification of cabinets in the field is great, and drives the manufacturers and cabinet design. Therefore, he suggested that the separation of the annexes from the body of the standard could help to standardize certification issues.

J. Wagner disagreed with this idea. He argued that the credibility of the certification is because it is attached to the prestige of NSF 49. J. Balsamo said that regarding the standard and annexes, manufacturers and field testers need better delineation for them to come together. Cabinets are certified to meet the standard as if the cabinet was operating. He favored the separation. M. Gibson agreed that some type of separation using 49 with a differentiation in name or numbering would be helpful. He pointed out that contracts refer to NSF 49 and test to it, so maintaining the name with a sub-part for the annex would be beneficial for continuity. D. Phillips expressed the opinion that keeping the current Joint Committee makeup is a good dynamic and provides vitality to the standard. S. Williams pointed out that there would not have to be a change in the JC if there was another standard formed. C. Binder asked if it was possible to change the name of the standard to specify “Certification and Requirements”. M.E. Kennedy added that changing the name of the standard is good idea. She also believes it a necessity to educate the users.

R. Powitz agreed that changing the name would be beneficial and the Joint Committee should make the certification process more realistic by reviewing annex F and G. He also stated that it would be beneficial to streamline the certification process and make it more specific. D. Phillips
stated that the Joint Committee oversees design and construction, field certification, and decontamination and could create the name to encompass all of these.

**Motion:** M. E. Kennedy made a motion to change the current title of standard 49 to “NSF 49 biosafety cabinetry construction and certification”. J. Balsamo seconded.

**Discussion:** J. Balsamo proposed separation in sections and clarification of titles in the annexes. J. Wagner stated the annexes are labeled clearly. W. Peters said we should look at the European standard title for biosafety cabinets, as their standard has annexes for certification, etc. R. Gilpin said if the Committee is concerned with field testing, then it should be included in the title. The Canadian title is “BSC Installation and Field Testing” as a point of reference.

**Friendly amendment:** The title shall be “NSF 49 Biosafety Cabinetry: Design, Construction, Performance, and Field Certification”. M. E. Kennedy and J. Balsamo accepted the amendment.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** All in favor.

*Motion passed. Language to be balloted.*