

**U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
Log of Meeting**

SUBJECT: WCMA Rigid Cord Shroud Task Group Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: May 24, 2018

LOCATION: Teleconference

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Rana Balci-Sinha

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: June 6, 2018

CPSC ATTENDEES: Rana Balci-Sinha, Howard Tarnoff

NON-CPSC ATTENDEES: Contact WCMA for the list of attendees

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

Task group (TG) chair Derick Marsh convened the meeting. The meeting log for April 10th meeting has been approved (see attached.) Mr. Marsh said that the difference between rigid cord shroud and cord restraining device seems to be cord accessibility. Therefore he asked if the task group could just say that if rigid cord shroud should meet the requirements for the cord restraining device. If a cord shroud is rigid and has accessible cords, it becomes a cord restraining device. If a cord shroud is rigid and no cord is accessible, then the rigidity has to be checked. In terms of rigidity, the formation of a hazardous loop needs to be tested. Ms. Kaiser asked if a cord is exposed that can be pulled from the shroud, then a wrap-around the neck testing is needed. Mr. Sendlak asked how to test if a single cord is covered. Marsh will have individual communications with the technical experts in the task group to develop a draft language. Next meeting is scheduled for June 14, 2018.



WINDOW COVERING
MANUFACTURERS
ASSOCIATION

Window Covering Manufacturers Association
Rigid Shroud Task Group Teleconference
April 10, 2018
10:00 am - 11:00 am ET
Call in: 866-210-1669
Passcode: 5754464 #

Minutes

I. Welcome and call to order

II. Antitrust review

Ralph Vasami reviewed the antitrust requirements governing the meeting.

III. Roll call

Derick Marsh – Chair
Rich Gottuso (Hunter Douglas)
Tom Merker (Springs Window Fashion)
Will Lynch (SafeTShade)
Rennato Ottaviani (Maxxmar Window Fashions)
Howard Tarnoff (CPSC)
Rana Balci-Sinha (CPSC)
Linda Kaiser (Parents for Window Blind Safety)
Ralph Vasami (WCMA)
Jim Anthony (Hunter Douglas)
Mike Twomey, Esq. (Kantor)
Jacquelyn Weber (SafeTShade)

IV. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes. Rich Gottuso seconded the motion.

Linda Kaiser wanted to clarify a paragraph under "Other Matters to Consider", for the sentence that reads, "Consensus among the Group was that a device designed to be installed in the field by someone other than the manufacturer (such as a retrofit device) was acceptable under the Standard and that this language was not designed to restrict installation of safety devices onto existing,

355 Lexington Avenue, 17th Floor
New York, NY 10017-6603
Phone: (212) 297-2122
Fax: (212) 370-9047

installed window coverings." The Group had issue with the statement "installed in the field by someone other than the manufacturer...was acceptable under the Standard."

Derick responded by saying that retrofits are a post-sale activity and therefore will not be addressed in this standard. That language was not designed to restrict the use of a retrofit device, as the original language implied.

The language in the minutes will change to, "consensus among the Group was that a device designed to be installed in the field by someone other than the manufacturer (such as a retrofit device) "is not addressed by the standard." The group came to consensus that this language should be modified in the minutes, and a note be made a future task group or committee resolve this issue.

Motion to approve as modified has been accepted. The minutes were approved.

V. Review Proposal

Derick led a discussion on the working draft of the standard. Relevant definitions discussed include; accessible cords, cord shroud, cord and bead chain restraining device.

The Group moved to formulate the definition of rigid, address the force and twist tests for the rigid covers, and discussed what the appropriate parameters for testing should be.

The Group then moved to a discussion on accessibility and the extent to which a person can touch the cord. This included discussions on the durability and longevity of the inaccessibility. The definition of inaccessible will be addressed in a future discussion.

Derick moved on to section 6.3 and opened up this section for discussion, mainly the prospect of creating a separate section under 6.3 for Rigid Designs. Derick explained that a rigid cord shroud can be considered a restraining device for the purposes of this standard. This led into a discussion of the differences between shrouding and covering and whether or not a warning sticker must be included on the device.

The Group agreed that a sample of each size of the shroud covering should be tested for durability. The Group also agreed to make a video illustrating how the shroud covering tests would work.

6.3.2.2- Derick led a discussion to determine the extent of testing for rigid shroud covers. Derick recognized that the Group needs to work on the parameters for deflection testing. He thought it was appropriate to leave this explanation in the section as opposed to Appendix C. Also discussed was testing requirements and rigidity of a flexible shroud cover on inner cords. Similar to rigid shroud covers, these parameters would be explained in this section.

VI. New Business

The Group agreed to explore concepts on performance requirements of rigidity of the shroud. It was agreed these tests cannot only cover whether or not a hazardous loop would form.

VII. Next meeting

The group agreed to have a call on Tuesday, May 8 at 11:30 am.

VIII. Adjourn