NSF International Nonfood Compounds Registration and Listing Program
Steering Committee Minutes
September 25, 2002
NSF Headquarters
Ann Arbor, MI USA

Steering Committee Members present:

Dick Cottrell, Sysco Corporation
Helen Harrison, Novozymes Biologicals, Inc.
Mark Gindling, Buckeye International, Inc.
Mike Paulson, NCH Corporation
Michael Dilucchio, Lad Cleaning Solutions
Bob MacDonald, SRC Consultants
Dominic Billie, Food Industry Consultants
Geoffrey Rapp, Bettcher Industries, Inc.
Lynn Dee, Bettcher Industries, Inc.
Mitsuhiro Okita, Okazaki-Shoten
Bill Connor, Total Fina Elf Lubricants USA, Inc.
Ahmed Tahir, Anderol Corporation
Michael Raab, Anderol Corporation
Sean M. O'Malley, CPI Engineering Services, Inc.
Bob Biles, Exxon Mobil Corporation
Fay Linn Lee, Shell International Petroleum Co., Ltd.
Tony Martini, Interlube Corporation
Ranjit Panesar, Ironsides Lubricants
James Frisbie, Sherwin Williams Diversified Brands, Inc.
Laura Profitt, Sherwin Williams Diversified Brands, Inc.
Ron McDaniel, USDA Food Safety Inspection Services (Via Phone)
Jack Donald, Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Dirk Fenner, Schaefer Technologies
Jim Kuhn, Association of Water Technologies (Via Phone)
Joe Lovett, Interlube Corporation

NSF Attendees:

Ray Jaglowski, Vice President, New Business Development
Kenji Yano, Program Manager, Nonfood Compounds
Jim Kendzel, Vice President, Standards Development
Stan Hazan, Executive Director, Training and Education
Mark Connors, Project Manager, Standards Development
Clif Mclellan, Director, Toxicology
Carmen Grindatti, Group Leader, Nonfood Compounds
Alice Edmunds, Chemist
Matt Holen, Toxicology Specialist
Dorothy Erby, Customer Service Representative, Nonfood Compounds
Evonne Tran, Administrative Assistant, New Business Development

8:30 – 8:45AM: Ray Jaglowski, VP New Business Development, NSF

Presented: *NSF Overview (Jaglowski's presentation attached)*

Summary: Jaglowski gave an overview of NSF's history and the programs and services it offers. He concluded that NSF has several advantages. These advantages include:

- Nearly 60 years of product certification experience
- A leading consensus based standards developer with over 44 active standards.
- A fully accredited standards developer and certified by American National Standards Institute (ANSI).
- A recognized world leading independent third-party certifier.
- Established in 1944, as the National Sanitation Foundation. Headquartered in Ann Arbor, Michigan. NSF is an independent, not-for-profit, non-governmental, third party organization. World Health Organization Collaborating Center for Food Safety and Drinking Water Safety and Treatment. The Public Health and Safety Company™.
- Mission Statement: NSF International, an independent, not-for-profit, non-governmental organization, is dedicated to being the leading global provider of public health and safety-based risk management solutions while serving the interests of all stakeholders.
- NSF Risk Management Capabilities
- NSF-Positioned for Leadership
- The Value of the NSF Mark
- NSF Certification Programs
- NSF Mark Exposure
- Building Brand Awareness – New Program Initiatives
- Consumer Affairs Office
- Consumer Web Support: www.nsf.org
- Building Brand Awareness – Mass Media Exposure

8:45 – 9:15AM: Kenji Yano, Program Manager, Nonfood Compounds Registration Program, NSF

Presented: *Registration and Listing Program Review (Yano presentation attached)*

Summary: Yano gave an overview of the NSF Nonfood Compounds Registration and Listing Program from its induction in January 2000 to the present. The following other areas were discussed:

- Termination of the USDA program: The USDA introduced a new safety inspection system, the performance-based HACCP system and subsequently terminated its compound authorization and listing program in July 1998.
- Changes: Safety responsibility has been transferred from manufacturers to users of

nonfood compounds (plants). Under the new system, plants must submit a HACCP plan and select appropriate products.

- New USDA Options for compound approval:
  -Formulation disclosure;
  -Use of 1998 USDA List;
  -Manufacturer "Letter of Guarantee";
  -Third-party verification. USDA revised the policy in 2001: All USDA-authorized products require additional manufacturer certification.
  -Third-party verified products are accepted without additional documentation.
- USDA Options to Third Parties:
  -Re-introduce "USDA-type" program with advice and support from USDA;
  -Expand upon prior USDA program.
- Industry Concerns over Termination:
  -Loss of oversight and technical resource;
  -Market acceptance of "letter of guarantee";
  -Confidence in technical ability of companies to provide assurances;
  -Registration of new formulations, company/product names;
  -And need for a central approval/listing system.
- NSF Program Strategy:
  -Voluntary and based on USDA guidelines;
  -Maintain continuity and USDA expertise;
  -Track USDA/FDA/EPA requirements;
  -Be guided by stakeholders' needs;
  -Expand scope – additional categories, international collaborations, etc.;
  -Cover all products used by food industry;
  -Leverage information technology to simplify and speed up process.
- NSF Program Elements: Flow chart showing the stages that a new product must go through in order to become registered.
- No. of Listed Companies (Approximate): 660
- Total No. of Listed Products USDA & NSF: 14,000
- Major Product Categories: Cleaning products (A1 – A8) 22%; water treatment products (G1 – G7) 23%; lubricants (H1-H3) 22%.
- Features of the online listing website (www.nsf.org/usda):
  -Advanced search engine;
  -Downloadable NSF registration letter;
  -Hyperlink to company website;
  -Product category code definition.
- No. of NSF Registered Products: July 2001 – 570 (130 companies); August 2002 – 2,100 (320 companies).
- NSF Review:
  -Formulation and label review;
  -No automatic sample submission;
  -Based on USDA Guidelines, which track USDA/FDA/EPA regulations.
- Development of ISO standard for food-grade lubricant: NSF is participating in the ISO Technical Committee Work Group and has requested to be the standards development organization to administer the U.S. adoption of the ISO Standard;
  -the current NSF H1 registration program meets all of the procedural requirements for future ISO-based certification program.
- International collaborations: New developments for 2002 include international collaborations with the Australia Quarantine Inspection Agency (AQIS) and the

Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA). AQIS now accepts NSF registration approval letters and guidelines. NSF and CFIA are meeting to identify the possibility of future collaboration.
- USDA Agricultural Marketing Service now allows inspectors to use the NSF White Book™ and the NSF listing website to validate nonfood compounds and proprietary substances.

Comments:
- Biles asked about the NSF recommended label. Yano stated the required information on the label includes: 1) Product Name; 2) Company Name; 3) NSF Registration Number; 4) Product Category Code; and, 5) NSF Registration Mark. There is no required font size as long as it is legible. If a printed label is not available at the time of review application, NSF will accept a "mock-up label" and start the review process. The manufacturer is responsible for completing all five items (above) once registration has been issued.
- Billie questioned the reasoning for limiting the range application to six products. McClellan, Director, Toxicology Services, answered that the limit was based on processing costs.
- Yano stated that formulators marketing products only via distributor are eligible for the Formulation Review Only option. Listing suppression can be available for these formulators.
- Yano reviewed the Wisconsin Sanitizer Program: The State of Wisconsin approves sanitizers used in restaurants and dairy plants as part of the contact utensil surface sanitizing; Efficacy tested by NSF; approved products listed on the NSF website and the W1 Category Code is used. Yano demonstrated how to review W1 testing data on the website at www.nsf.org/usda.
- Profitt asked if it was possible to download the NSF registration mark from the NSF website. Yano answered that the mark is available on the web at www.nsf.org/mark/download_marks.html.
- Cottrell asked how labels can be submitted with the confidential application. Yano answered that the labels can be mailed, faxed or e-mailed to Nonfood@nsf.org.
- Biles asked how many companies have ingredients registered. Yano answered that there are currently 13 companies who have ingredients registered. These companies are listed on the NSF website.
- Tahir asked if the review process is the same for products and ingredients. Yano replied that the review process for products and ingredients is the same.
- Tahir also asked how a review is handled if an ingredient is provided by multiple suppliers. Yano replied if the CAS No. is the same, review is not affected. Manufacturers must submit alternative supplier names.
- Panesar asked if NSF would allow the number of ingredients that vary in a range submission to change from two. McLellan answered that the change would cause more work to be done and could result in a priced changes so the answer to the question is "no."

9:15 – 10:00AM: Alice Edmunds, Chemist, NSF

Presented: *Odor Testing Guidelines Review (Edmunds' presentation attached)*

- USDA Method A
- USDA Method B
- NSF Method (Proposed 2001)
- Steering Committee – Recommendations
- Recommendations Addressed
- NSF Proposed Method Revised

Summary: Edmunds presented on the process involved in Odor Evaluation Test Method. Edmunds provided brief details on the two USDA Methods, which are Method A & Method B (description of each method is included in Edmunds attached presentation). NSF Method, proposed in 2001, was almost identical to the USDA Method A. After a review of the methods, the Steering Committee recommended adding more panelist and controls to the test so the results would be more statically accurate. Thus, the NSF Proposed Method – Revised included 7-20 panelists (7 minimum) and positive (2 mg/L limonene) and negative controls (water). There were various recommendations from several participants at the meeting.

Comments:
- Cottrell indicated that many ingredients, such as detergents have a natural odor and thus just about every product would have some odor associated with it. Based on this, he wondered how any product could pass testing. Edmunds responded, "that while this was true, such odors are generally mild, and thus would be eliminated through the rinse part of the test, provided that the product's category code required a rinse."
- Another comment Cottrell added was the rinse needed the strongest dilution possible. Jaglowski added there would be a huge difference in test results depending on if cold water or hot water is used. In conclusion, Jaglowski recommended that a letter be sent asking for suggestions on the product concentration, the temperature of the water, and the need for accepting differences among manufactures' instructions.
- The Steering Committee's only suggestion was to further define the rinse portion of the test.

9:15 – 10:00AM: Carmen Grindatti, Nonfoods Group Leader, NSF

Presented: *Pesticide Labeling Issue (Grindatti's presentation attached)*

Summary: Grindatti gave an update on the issue: Pesticide Labeling. The issue presented was that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does not allow the addition of third party logos on EPA approved pesticide labels by non-notification. The consensus among customers of the companies affected is that they wish to see a third-party registration before purchasing a product. NSF is aware of one company who has approached the EPA about this issue. The result of the EPA's last meeting about this issue is that the logos will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

Presented: *Recommended Guidelines Update (presentation attached)*

Summary: Grindatti informed the group that several changes will be made to the guidelines (version 3.0). It was asked when these changes would be made. Grindatti indicated that the changes will be made as soon as possible and that the new guidelines would be posted on the NSF website, and the next edition of the NSF White Book™ will contain the updated guidelines.

The issue of Heat Transfer Fluid was also brought up in Grindatti's presentation. The main focus of this issue is whether H1 and P1 should be listed together for products that are considered lubricants and heat transfer fluids. NSF took the stance that heat transfer fluids should be registered as P1 because the labeling of heat transfer fluids is not consistent with the use as a lubricant. NSF will allow companies to create a new label/trade name for the product and submit one as a lubricant and one as a heat transfer fluid.

Comments:

- Jaglowski recommended that a memo be sent out providing information about P1 and H1 and requesting feedback.
- Finally, the formation of a working group with volunteers from as many industries as possible was requested.

10:15 – 10:55AM: Kenji Yano, NSF

Presented: *NSF Tentative Plans: How long should USDA listings remain in the NSF White Book™? (Yano's presentation attached)*

Summary: Yano stated that there have been so many changes to USDA authorized products since 1998 that the USDA no longer recommends the use of the old USDA list and that confidence in the old authorizations continues to decline. Yano stated the NSF's tentative plan is to discontinue listing of USDA authorizations (Sunset) from 2003 starting with the H1 category (incidental contact lubricants). The plan was based on the assumption that the effects of sunset on manufacturers of H1 products would be minimal since more than half of the H1 products listed in the NSF White Book™ are already NSF registered.

There were questions and statements regarding the validity of the USDA authorized products in the 2002NSF White Book™ and NSF's tentative plan for sunset:

Comments:

- A question was asked on how to verify the formulation of old USDA authorized products. Yano responded that USDA has the formulation and label information. NSF would not have this information unless the product is submitted for NSF registration. He also stated that NSF can list a USDA authorized product in the White Book™ if the manufacturer provides a statement that the product's formulation has not changed since the authorization was issued.
- There were concerns about taking the USDA H1 products out of the NSF White Book™.

- Lee commented that all the USDA authorized products should be removed from the NSF White Book™ as soon as possible.
- Biles stated that to sunset should be applied to all categories and should not single out H1.
- Paulson agreed with Biles and stated that some companies including his company have both lubricant and cleaning products.
- There were concerns stated regarding the cost of converting from USDA authorization to NSF registration. Yano responded that there is an incentive fee for rollover (from USDA to NSF) plus a batch submission discount option.
- In conclusion, Jaglowski indicated that NSF would implement sunset for all categories and a possible time line for sunset would be 2004. He also recommended that the 2003 White Book™ would list NSF registered products and USDA authorized products in separate sections.

10:15 – 10:55AM: Ron McDaniel, Food Technologist, USDA Food Safety Inspection Services

Presented: *Regulatory perspective, Questions & Answers (McDaniel's document attached)*

Summary: McDaniel is a Food Technologist assigned to the TSC in Omaha, Nebraska. He indicated that he has been with the agency for over 30 years and has worked in just about all aspects of meat and poultry inspection. McDaniel has been asked to discuss the regulatory perspective of approval/registration of Nonfood compounds.

McDaniel spoke on the following topics:

- October 20, 1999: Final Rule entitled, "Sanitation Requirements for Official Meat and Poultry Establishments.
- Eliminated – Regulation requiring the authorization of nonfood compounds prior to their use in a federally inspected meat or poultry establishment.
- New sanitation regulations (9 CFG, Part 416.4) nonfood compounds and processing aids used in an establishment must be safe under the conditions of use. The establishment must have documentation on file (on company letterhead) establishing the safety of a chemical's use in a food-processing environment.
- Food Safety Inspection Service has developed a Sanitation Performance Compliance Guide. This Guide and relevant information may be accessed at: http://www.fsis.usda.gov/OPPDE/RDAD/FRPubs/sanitationcover.htm http://www.fsis.usda.gov/oa/update/2000/04070.htm; http://www.fsis.usda.gov/OPPEDE/larc/CBRP%2020Criteria.htm; and http://www.fsis.usda.gov/OPPDE/LARC/ShellGuide.htm

Comments:
McDaniel responded to the below listed questions as follows:

- Feedback on usefulness/effectiveness of the 2002 NSF White Book™ with manufacturer statement? There has not been any type of survey of the inspection force on this, but if I were the inspector in the field I see how it could be very useful

just the same way the old Proprietary Substances and Nonfood Compounds book was, which Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) used to publish.

- Acceptance of the NSF White Book™ by FSIS inspectors. If I were in the field, I would welcome this book as a source for acceptance for nonfood compounds.
- McDaniel also stated that they need more information on how to help inspectors understand the purpose of the NSF White Book™.
- Are there any future changes on acceptance of USDA approved products? Not aware of any at this time.
- Are there any issues or future changes on acceptance of manufacturer self-certification? Not aware of any at this time.
- Is the NSF tentative plan acceptable? From what I know it seems as if the plan is on the right course.
- Any recommendation on timing for sunset of USDA approved products? As far as I know, there has not been any official recommendation.
- McDaniel was asked if any attention was paid to the label or do inspectors check the product listing. The response was they look at the White Book™ and the letter first. They need training to look at the label.
- McDaniel was also asked if there is any acceptable standard for the letter of guarantee. His response was that there is nothing in the letter that shows that they have showed us any data. Inspectors may ask for Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) and the letter must have condition of use.
- Yano stated that NSF needs to do more marketing to inspectors, including sending out copies of the NSF White Book™ CDs to all inspectors.
- Paulson suggested a chat room on the NSF website.

10:55 – 11:30AM: Mark Connors, Program Manager of Standards, NSF

Presented: *Incidental Contact Lubricant, Status on ISO Standard Development (Connors' presentation attached)*

Summary: Connors presented to the Steering Committee an update on the most recent developments of ISO TC 199 WG2's draft standard *Safety of Machinery - Hygiene Requirements for the Use and Handling of Lubricants with Incidental Product Contact.*

The Working Group's (WG) decision to remove US FDA 21 CFR as the normative reference in the document was discussed. The WG decided they should not reference a document that was country-specific in an international standard. Accordingly, terms such as "H1", "H2", etc., were also removed as these terms are from the USDA's former program.

It was noted that US FDA 21 CFR is a document that has worldwide acceptance and has been in use for more than twenty years as a source for evaluating direct and indirect food additive ingredients. Also, many manufacturers cite "21 CFR" and "H1" when marketing their products.

Oppositionally, also discussed was the fact that there is often a substantial waiting period for FDA acceptance of ingredients petitioned for 21 CFR acceptance and that some countries have their own acceptable ingredient source lists and are not dependant on US FDA 21 CFR.

As such, the Steering Committee's recommendation to ISO TC199 WG2 is:

- Both SCF Directive 89/107/EEC of 21 December 1988 and the US FDA 21 CFR should be listed as normative references for assessing the acceptability of incidental contact lubricant ingredients.
- Provisions be made within the standard for the resolution of possible conflicts between the two sources.

Comments:
- The NSF Steering Committee's recommendation will be submitted to Dr. John Holah of ISO TC 199 WG2 for their consideration during their October 7-8, 2002 in Paris.

11:30AM – 12:30PM: Lunch

12:30 – 2:00PM: Jim Kendzel, Vice President of Standards Development, NSF

Presented: *Environmentally Preferred Products (EPP) Standards Development (Kendzel's presentation attached)*

The topics presented were:

- Executive Order 13101, Greening the Government Through Waste Prevention, Recycling and Federal Acquisition (1998).
- EPA will develop guidance for governmental purchasing of products and services.
- NSF received grant to evaluate potential for development of voluntary consensus standards.
- What is EPP?
  Environmentally Preferred Products are products that have a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products that serve the same purpose. The product comparison may consider research and development, raw materials acquisition, production, manufacturing, packaging, distribution, reuse, operation, maintenance or disposal (EO 13101, Section 201).
- NSF's Role: NSF discussed concept with several industry sectors to determine amount of interest in the development of a standard. Chemical cleaner and sanitizer industry expressed the most interest in pursuing project. Focus on hard surface cleaners to develop "template" standard. Joint Committee formed in 2002 to begin development of standard.
- Scope of Standard:
  Combination of product standard and management system standard.
  Specifies requirements for Product Development Process – Environmental Management System (PDP-EMS)
  Standard does not "state specific environmental performance criteria…"
- Areas Covered:
  -Environmental policy
  -Procedures to identify environmental aspect during product development

-Environmental objectives and targets
-Overall management system criteria for product development
-Internal systems for document control, records, and audits

Comments:

- The question was asked if this would always be a voluntary standard. The response was that hopefully after developing the standard the government will recognize it as the environmentally preferred product standard.
- The comment was made that NSF should, when building the product, consider not only product development but also disposal, packaging, etc.

12:30 – 2:00PM: Mike Paulson, NCH Corporation

Presented: *Sanitizer Registration and European Regulations (Paulson's presentation attached)*

Summary: Paulson from NCH International or Corporation presented, "European approvals for Disinfectants and sanitizers." (See attached presentation)

Paulson's presentation covered the following:

- Current NSF Registration Guidelines: "5.5 Antimicrobical Agents: Product shall be registered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for use in food establishments and adequate documentation of that registration, including registered EPA labels, which shall be provided to NSF for review."
- Comparison of European and USA Disinfectant Registration Requirements: Mr. Paulson compared the difference between USDA Disinfectant/sanitizers and EU Disinfectant/sanitizers.
- Survey of OECD Member Countries' Approaches to the Regulation of Biocides, 99. This includes: public health disinfectants and sanitizer; personal health care disinfectants; non public health (private) disinfectants/sanitizers/bacteriostats; veterinary area and domestic animal disinfects; food/fee area disinfectants; food/feed area disinfectants; and drinking water disinfectants.
- Resistance: All 23 biocide product types; as categorized by EU; the applicant must submit sufficient efficacy data to substantiate the label claim against the target organism(s) in the normal conditions of use; and the principles for an harmonized evaluation of the dossiers and decision taken for the authorization of a biocidal product by member states are provided by annex VI to the directive, the common principles.
- Proposal: Allow country (region) specific biocide registration to qualify a disinfectant/sanitizer for NSF listing as long as all other NSF requirements are met.

Comments:

- The question was asked if it would be reasonable to add a category along the lines of the European category code? It was stated that it would be a toxicology issue.
- Paulson stated that the European Biocide Directive has a single category for food products, and they have to meet that requirement.

12:30-2:00PM: Kenji Yano, NSF

Presented: *MSDS Listing Program (Yano's presentation attached)*

Summary: Yano explained the NSF plans to launch an online MSDS listing service next year.

The plan was developed in response to manufacturers of water treatment chemicals. The proposed service is optional and will be available to all raw materials and finished products. On-line listing will be maintained by participating companies and two-way links will be created between the NSF White Book (**www.nsf.org/usda**) and the MSDS websites allowing users to view/download both product registration information and MSDS.

Comments:

- It was suggested by a committee member that it would be nice to have the MSDS' available in different languages and automatic MSDS formatting capabilities in multiple languages would also be helpful.
- Yano stated that the project is still in its initial stages, but he is accepting ideas and feedback on the project. He also stated that NSF would look into the feasibility of the automatic formatting capabilities on the web.

2:00 – 2:15PM: Break

2:15 – 3:00PM: Jack Donald, CFIA

Presented*: International Developments: Canadian Food Inspection Agency (AQIS)??? Approval (Donald's presentation attached)*

Summary: Mr. Donald presented the following:

- CFIA Overview
    a. Restructuring of the Food Inspection in Canada

       Prior to April 1997 Federal Food Inspection in Canada comprised of three primary Federal Ministries

       -Ministry of Health Canada
       -Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans Canada
       -Ministry of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

    b. Bill C-60 Single Food Inspection Agency Act
       -In December, 1996 the Food Inspection Agony Bill was tabled in the Canadian Parliament, House of Commons by the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada.

-This legislation brought about the creation of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA), designed to consolidate the operations of federal food inspectors under a single agency.
-CFIA administers or enforces the following acts. As Canada's Food Safety Regulator, we administer 14 different programs related to foods, plants and animals.
-We have oversight over three important agency activities: Food Safety, Plant Protection and Animal Health.

c. Food Safety: Inspections, Bureau of Food Safety and Consumer Protection, Food Investigation and Recalls, Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and Food Safety Prerequisite Programs for HACCP, Food Safety Enhancement Program (FSEP) and Quality Management Program (QMP).

Non-Food Chemical Program – Mr. Donald reviewed the Evaluation Protocol for Non-Food Chemicals, Evaluation of Non-Food Chemicals; Non-Food Chemicals Categories; and Non-food Chemicals Exception Categories; Conditions for Exemption of Non-Food Chemicals.

Reference Listing Web Site:

http://www.inspection.gc.ca/english/ppc/reference/cone.shtml

Mr. Donald commented after the presentation that NSF and CFIA are slated to meet in October 2002 for collaboration. Currently, Canada has no regulations for food grade lubricants. Any changes in approved products in Canada renders the approval letter null and void. They are also considering putting an expiration date on the letter.

Approved products are listed on their website, www.inspection.gc.ca. The list is updated about twice a week.

2:15 – 3:00PM: Michael Raab, Australian Quarantine Inspection Agency (AQIS) Approval

Presented: *Australian Quarantine Inspection Agency (AQIS) Approval (Raab's presentation attached)*

Summary: Raab covered the following topics in his presentation:

- The need for what?
- AQIS Requirements
- Overview of Approval Process
- Sample AQIS Application
- Why We Requested NSF Assistance
- AQIS Approval Letter
- Summary

Raab stated that his role is to ensure that his company's products have approval. NSF served as an instrument in preparing technical submission to AQIS. Within 45 days of submission of the applications to AQIS, their approval letters were back with no questions except one amended letter to remove reference to manufacturing site.

NSF was effective in providing Anderol with expert support and guidance.

Raab indicated that AQIS is in the process of updating their guidelines using NSF's (what?) as a model. They also accept H1 and H2 registrations. The category descriptions are very similar to the H1 and H2's of the NSF.

2:15 – 3:00PM: Mitsuhiro Okita, Okazaki-Shoten

Presented: *Issue of Lubrication in the Food/Beverage Industries in Japan (Okita's presentation attached)*

Summary: Okita of Okazai-Shoten presented the following points:

- Plants/Production Volume in Japan (2001)
- Production Flow in Plant – Beverage in Japan
- Main Equipment – Beverage in Japan
- Percent of Food-Grade Lubes by Lubricating Part
- States in 1989
- Development/Market of Safety Lubes
- Plants' Reaction
- Issues in Beverage Industry of Japan
- What We Have To Do In the Future

There has been misunderstanding in the Japanese food industry concerning the difference between H1 and H2 lubricants. Okita stated that they had made efforts to introduce H1 (incidental contact) food-grade lubricants in the beverage industry in Japan. He stated that he was starting to notice increased use of H1 vs. H2 lubricants for incidental contact use in the beverage industry; however, he stated that continuous education is needed for the Japanese market. There is no regulation on food-grade lubricants. Most manufacturers are importing ingredients from outside of the country.

3:00 – 4:00PM: Open Discussion

Yano stated that NSF plans to start an electronic newsletter reaching program participants, USDA inspectors and users to encourage participation.

The minutes from this meeting and draft action items will be provided to all meeting participants.