

U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
LOG OF MEETING

SUBJECT: Soft infant and toddler carrier – Nursing in Carrier/Warnings task group.

DATE OF MEETING: 18 January 2018

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Hope E J. Nesteruk, ESMC

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: 24 January 2018

LOCATION: Teleconference

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Hope Nesteruk, ESMC; Tim Smith, ESHF; Dan Dunlap, CRE

NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Contact ASTM for attendance list.

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

At the October ASTM meeting for soft infant and toddler carriers (SITCs), the subcommittee discussed recent fatal incidents that involve suffocation after breastfeeding. This was the first meeting of the task group, which was formed at that October meeting and is seeking to address the hazard though adding a warning regarding repositioning after feeding, similar to the one used for sling carriers (F2907).

The group discussed the wording used in the sling carrier warnings: "If you nurse your baby in carrier, always reposition after feeding so baby's face is not pressed against your body."

Discussion topics included:

- Adding "even if baby falls asleep" to the end of the statement. Some people supported, but others thought it was redundant and didn't clarify that the child should be unlatched.
- Adding "... always unlatch and reposition..." to clarify that the child should be unlatched from the breast and repositioned. The concern was that breaking the latch to get the child's nose and mouth away from the body was a key message that needed to be conveyed. However, other concerns were that this phrase could be misinterpreted as telling the consumer to unlatch the carrier itself before repositioning the child.
- Targeting this message specifically to babies younger than 4 months, which is the vulnerable population. Although there was consensus that this was the age of concern, the suffocation warning was already targeting the age.
- For SITC that preclude breastfeeding, such as those that only allow front-facing carries, the task group agreed that they should be exempt from having to include the breastfeed warning.

- When reviewing the entire warning, one task group member noted that overall, the warning was inconsistent with the use of “baby” versus “infant.” The task group agreed that changing all references to “infant” to “baby,” for consistency, would be a good idea, while warning content was under review.

In addition to the warning content, CPSC staff was asked about warning formatting and the discrepancies between ad hoc requirements and the current, codified standard. The concern raised was that if a new ASTM standard was published that harmonized with ad hoc, it would be different from the CFR. Because some retailers require compliance with the latest standard *and* the CFR, task group members were unsure how to comply with both. CPSC technical staff expressed that they didn’t see where the current requirements *conflicted* with the ad hoc requirements. In addition, staff commented that ad hoc was essentially a minimum suggestion, and subcommittees were free to add additional requirements or use only the ones that were pertinent to their standard.