

Task Group on Food Equipment Materials
Teleconference Meeting Summary
April 8, 2025

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Participating Members:

Dipak Negandhi (A.O. Smith Corporation)
Stephen Schaefer (Hoshizaki America, Inc.)
Tony Gagliardi (consultant – public health)
Jonathan Brania (Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.)
Robert Sudler (FDA)

Mike Kohler (NSF)
Swati Bhatt (Los Angeles County)
Syed Rizvi (Marmon Foodservice)
Burl Finkelstein (Kason Industries)

Absent Members:

Michèle Samarya-Timm (NEHA)
Joe Wallace (A.O. Smith Water Products Co.)

Massoud Neshan (Southern CaseArts)

Participating observers:

Al Rose (NSF)
Danielle Escolas (Intertek)
Patrick Blad (Nemco)
Robert Dunn (ITW Food Equipment Group)
Larry Levine (NSF)
Kaylyn Brunscole (Dominos Pizza)
Brook Hatton (CSA Group)

Michael Perez (Consultant)
Nicholas Unger (CSA Group)
Daniele Nanni (Carpigiani)
Scott Smith (JM Smucker)
Rachel Rifenberg (A.O. Smith Corp.)
Bernard Cichon (Meiko)

Supplemental Materials Referenced

- [Approval of 2i48r4 et al - Glass-Like Material Requirements - Description and Ballot.pdf](#)
- [2i48r5 et al - Glass-Like Material Requirements](#)
- [2i48r3 et al - Glass-Like Material Requirements - Description and Ballot.pdf](#)
- [2i48r3 et al - Glass-Like Material Requirements - Straw Ballot COMMENTS.pdf](#)
- [51i29r2 - Bisphenols and PFAS - 2025.01.28 - Final.docx](#)
- [JCFE Meeting Summary - 2024-10-16 - PFAS Excerpt.pdf](#)
- [NSF 51 TG on Food Materials -Meeting Feb 2025 -PFAS - Final.pptx](#)
- [FE-2024-13 - Impact Test Method.pdf](#)
- [JCFE Meeting Summary - 2024-10-16 – Impact Test Method Excerpt](#)

Discussion

D.Negandhi welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A.Rose read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Nine of the 12 voting members were present (75%), which represented a quorum. He then presented the agenda and turned the meeting over to D.Negandhi.

Motion, M.Kohler:

Accept previous meeting minutes

Second:

T.Gagliardi

Discussion:

M.Perez corrected the last bullet of action items stating that he doesn't have the expertise to complete this task.

All in favor

Task Group on Food Equipment Materials
Teleconference Meeting Summary
April 8, 2025

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Meeting notes:

- **Meeting Introduction:**
 - A.Rose and D.Negandhi initiated the meeting by greeting the attendees and confirming the quorum. A.Rose read the antitrust statement to ensure compliance with antitrust laws, emphasizing the importance of avoiding any comments or actions that could restrict competition.
- **Acceptance of Previous Meeting Minutes:**
 - **Request for Acceptance:** D.Negandhi requested the acceptance of the previous meeting minutes and provided a recap of the action items from that meeting. He asked A.Rose to display the previous meeting minutes for review.
 - **Correction Noted:** Michael noted a correction regarding the impact test method, stating that he lacked the expertise to test the proposed impact test method against the existing method. He mentioned that he had submitted a new test protocol for ceramic coatings on pots and pans.
 - **Non-Stick Coatings section:** D.Negandhi suggested removing that from action items unless someone wants to put in a new issue paper. Reasoning: The TG chair and issue proponent discussed and believe the non-stick coating section move is unnecessary. Glass-like coatings are currently not permitted, so they are being added to that section of the standard. Fluoropolymer coatings are being removed from organic coatings (sections 6.2.1.7. and 6.2.1.8). However, nonstick coatings will continue to be permitted. These other coatings may be, in fact, organic.
 - **Minutes Accepted:** The meeting minutes were accepted after a motion by M.Kohler and a second by T.Gagliardi. D.Negandhi confirmed that there were no further corrections or objections, and the minutes were officially accepted.

Topic #1

- **Glass-Like Material Requirements:**
 - **Ballot Revisions:** D.Negandhi and M.Kohler discussed the revisions to the ballot, including the addition of rice cookers and the requirement for coated food contact parts to be removable. They agreed that the revisions addressed previous concerns and decided to send the revised ballot to the Joint Committee for further review.

D.Negandhi recapped the previous work and M.Kohler explained that revision 4 was already approved through the TG straw ballot and although more work was completed developing an R5 ballot, he feels the R4 ballot is ready to go to JC approval ballot as is.

D.Negandhi suggested that the ultimate concern for the group to discuss is how replaceable the surface of the equipment is if damaged. Specifically is it removable or does the entire equipment need to be replaced.

Task Group on Food Equipment Materials
Teleconference Meeting Summary
April 8, 2025

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

M.Kohler explained all the research he was able to do at the recent NAFEM show. Many manufacturers stated the ease with which most of the surfaces could be easily replaced, and indeed are replaced on a routine basis anyway.

J.Brania – confirmed the term ‘removeable’ is pointed out in Standard 4. M.Perez added that based on M.Kohler’s research he removed the term ‘readily’ from ‘readily removeable’

D.Negandhi suggested the next step is to send to JC ballot and M.Kohler reiterated his belief that there’s no need to go to R5.

S.Bhatt asked for additional understanding regarding rice cookers, specifically whether this meant the liner is removeable or is it referring to the internal parts as well. M.Kohler confirmed this is explained using the phrase “parts” in the language:

Glass and glass-like coatings including, but not limited to, porcelain enamel or ceramic coatings may be permitted on direct food contact surfaces of panini grills, roller grills, rice cookers, and waffle irons. The coated food contact **parts** shall be removable.

P.Blad was asked and provided perspective as a manufacturer of the equipment, stating there is only one size roller grill we make which would not be considered portable, and the one panini grill they make is too big to be considerable portable, but has a removeable surface.

M.Kohler reiterated this is why he wanted to stick with the R4 language as is, and the group reached the same consensus.

Language to be sent to JC as approval ballot.

Topic #2

Bisphenols and PFAS

D.Negandhi recapped that prior to the previous TG meeting in February, there was a request to review the State Regulations as presented during the JC meeting last October. He recapped the work done and that the TG was unable to discussed in February because most of the time was spent on the other open issue.

M.Kohler and D.Negandhi confirmed they did in fact look at the varying states regulations, and that their R2 language is aligned with what is illustrated in 4.1.2:

4.1.2 Food zone materials shall not contain ~~lead, arsenic, cadmium, or mercury~~ any of the following as intentional ingredients.

- Lead;
- Arsenic;
- Cadmium;

Task Group on Food Equipment Materials
Teleconference Meeting Summary
April 8, 2025

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

- Mercury;
- Bisphenols, including BPA, BPAF, BPF, and BPS

Brass and bronze materials may contain lead as permitted under Section 4.2.3.2.

4.1.3 Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) shall not be added as intentional ingredients of materials used to manufacture tableware, cooking containers, cooking surfaces or cooking utensils.

D.Negandhi further confirmed the updates made from R1 to R2, specifically the addition of section 4.1.3 and the added definition for PFAS proposed for Standard 170

3.xxx PFAS: Perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances. Any chemical with at least a perfluorinated methyl group (-CF₃) or a perfluorinated methylene group (-CF₂-) without any H/Cl/Br/I atom attached to it (OECD 2021₁ definition). Chemicals considered to be PFAS can be found in the OECD database of PFAS chemicals.

D.Negandhi opened the floor for comments.

J. Brania reminded the group that this was discussed during the JC F2F meeting last October and the group voted on a specific approach, adding that this TG should follow those outlines. From that meeting summary:

Motion, B.Finkelstein: TG should focus on option 2 presented, which is to limit the use to the current list of six PFAS Chemicals

Second: B.Glynn

Discussion: None

Vote: Twenty-two in favor, Zero opposed, Zero Abstain

Motion: Carries

D.Negandhi confirmed that M.Kohler and he started there, and this language evolved from that process. M.Perez reminded the group that ultimately, approval comes in the form of an approval ballot.

D.Escolas indicated her concern is understanding what the equipment manufacturers want, adding that perhaps this should be optional instead of mandatory. She also said she was interested in knowing where the FDA stands.

R.Sudler said that understanding this was discussed last October and at the time he indicated there was nothing on the immediate horizon from the FDA. He added that given the recent government adjustments, nothing to his knowledge has changed. Said he cannot speak for the EPA but there are no current plans coming from the recent Conference on Food Protection either.

B. Cichon suggested if this language be made mandatory it might indeed be too early.

D.Negandhi stated that of course manufacturers do not want to change things as it costs money, but states are going to start implementing regulations very soon regardless. D.Escolas said the real question is whether we are going to force this on manufacturers.

Task Group on Food Equipment Materials
Teleconference Meeting Summary
April 8, 2025

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.
--

M.Kohler reminded the group that when R1 was sent to JC approval ballot, there were only 2 negative votes, neither of which were from manufacturers.

M.Perez indicated that in his opinion the JC should act on something since the FDA isn't going to do anything.

B.Cichon revised his comment a bit stating he would indeed be in favor of this R2 proposal. This new proposal limits items somewhat and is more targeted to food zones than the R1 ballot.

J.Brania stated that PFAS is on everyone's radar and what he is trying to get across is the federal regulations which have been out there. The FDA has very prominent language on the website stating they don't have a problem with PFAS. States are slightly ahead, but we still need the industry to weigh in.

M.Perez said that just because FDA hasn't taken a stand, doesn't mean NSF cannot.

With time running out, D.Negandhi proposed forming a small ad hoc group with J.Brania to determine the next steps for the task group and the Joint Committee regarding this PFAS issue.

Meeting Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned after a motion by J.Brania and a second by T.Gagliardi.

Action Items:

1. A.Rose – send R4 Glasslike ballot to JC approval ballot
2. D.Negandhi – form a small ad hoc group with J.Brania to determine the next steps for the task group and the Joint Committee regarding this PFAS issue.