

LOG OF MEETING DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES

SUBJECT: ASTM F15.77 Standard for Marketing & Labeling Magnet Sets Containing Small Loose, Powerful Magnets with a Flux Index ≥ 50

DATE OF MEETING: November 25, 2019 1:30pm, EST

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Stephen Harsanyi, ESHF

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: November 26, 2019

LOCATION: Teleconference

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Stephen Harsanyi (ESHF), Timothy Smith (ESHF), Susan Bathalon (EXHR), and Patricia Edwards (EXHR)

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

Summary of meeting:

The subcommittee discussed the efforts of the Scope Task Group, which met twice (November 18 and 21, 2019) and discussed other possible requirements to expand the scope of the draft standard. The main requirements under consideration included the following:

- Child-resistant or similar packaging, such as Poison Prevention Packaging Act (PPPA)-compliant packaging or the two-step closures employed in ASTM F3159 for liquid laundry packets
- Visual verification of entire set via packaging design or by requesting that consumers create specific structures prior to repackaging
- Changes to magnet size, flux index, or both

Arguments put forth in favor of child-resistant or similar packaging, some form of visual verification, or a combination of the two requirements, included: reduced accessibility of the product to children younger than age 5, visual and tactile reminders of the hazard, and the ability of the consumer to confirm that no magnets are missing from the set. Arguments against these measures included: increased manufacturing costs, a lack of definitive incident data demonstrating that children under age 5 accessed magnets from their packaging at the time of the incidents, the potential for additional time and effort required for repackaging to discourage use of the storage containers, and the overall effectiveness depends on consumers finding all of the magnets and having the time, inclination, and capability to repack the sets in their entirety after every use.

Regarding possible requirements involving changing magnet size, flux index, or both, manufacturers argued that any changes to the size or flux index would harm the intended utility of the product and increase costs (if the magnets are enlarged). Further, they contended that such changes would likely prevent manufacturers from complying with the standard. Representatives from health and safety organizations voiced opposition to the exclusion of requirements that do not eliminate the hazard.

At the end of the meeting, CPSC Human Factors staff asked the subcommittee to consider additional issues, including: the appropriateness of referring to Poison Control in the warning label (based on prior discussions within the Instructional Literature Task Group), the implications of marketing the product as appropriate for non-child populations with a predisposition to mouthing inedible objects, and the potential harm to the perception of the hazard from referring to the product as a “toy.” Regarding the issue of referring to the product as a toy, the majority of members who voiced an opinion claimed that calling the

product a toy, such as an “adult desktoy,” will be fine as long as referring to it as a “children’s toy” is forbidden.

Next Steps:

The draft standard has been edited, including type size limits, and circulated within the subcommittee. Subcommittee members may provide further edits to the draft standard. The subcommittee plans to have a poll to determine if the draft standard is ready to be balloted.