

## UNITED STATES

## CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

4330 EAST WEST HIGHWAY
BETHESDA, MD 20814
COMMISSIONER PETER A. FELDMAN

## STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER PETER A. FELDMAN ON FIREWALLED THIRD-PARTY TESTING LABORATORY ACCREDITATION PROCESS

## JULY 22, 2022

Today, the Commission voted to renew the accreditation for the firewalled third-party testing laboratory owned by the Step 2 Company, LLC ("Step 2"). Under the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, manufacturers and importers are required to test children's products for safety using either third-party laboratories or labs that are "firewalled" against the possibility of undue influence. I have raised concerns previously about CPSC's accreditation process for these laboratories and have been troubled by the lack of diligence with which the Commission reviews applicants' assertions, including about undue influence. I have also called for a reexamination of a process that too often has felt like a rubber stamp. Since I joined CPSC, I have consistently voted to withhold blanket delegations of authority to approve these reaccreditations but have not always been successful. This is a longstanding debate and I am pleased now to see some agreement that reform is needed.

Agency staff has admitted that the laboratory accreditation process is largely a paper exercise that relies on a firm's own attestations and documents. CPSC does not conduct on-site inspections or perform other verifications to ensure these laboratories are independent. While my concerns with the existing process extend beyond the accreditation of foreign laboratories, I am particularly concerned about laboratories in the People's Republic of China and other countries that do not have cultures of transparency or whistleblower protections. When I asked how CPSC ensures that laboratory workers are able to report allegations of undue influence confidentially in countries where free speech is restricted, I was told we simply take the applicants at their word. Whistleblowers must be able to communicate freely with CPSC without fear of retaliation, yet I am unaware of any specific examples of whistleblowing from certain authoritarian countries. This alone illustrates the need for review and reform to the way we certify these labs.

I have no reason to believe that Step 2, a U.S. company, with no known history of undue influence, has any issues with its firewalled laboratory. Accordingly, I am comfortable voting to approve its reaccreditation. Nevertheless, I wish to reiterate my concerns which I hope we will now address as a Commission. We should also reexamine the existing delegations under which agency staff can renew laboratory accreditations without Commission oversight or approval. This is an important discussion and I look forward to continued work on this issue. Perhaps there is finally a majority to support meaningful reforms that will better protect our most vulnerable consumers.