

# U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission

## LOG OF MEETING

**SUBJECT: ASTM In-Bed Sleepers Task Group for Stability**

**DATE OF MEETING: June 04, 2020**

**NOTE: The meeting notice was inadvertently not filed due to the belief that another co-worker had already filed it.**

**LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Carlos Torres**

**LOCATION: Teleconference**

**CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Carlos Torres, Lawrence Mella, Suad Wanna-Nakamura**

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

### **SUMMARY OF MEETING:**

This Task Group (TG) meeting was to refine general and performance requirements for stability and other requirements. The meeting began by discussing a summary of bassinet's incident data as basis for In-Bed Sleepers performance requirements development. Looking at the data, one member emphasized that even when *added bedding* is the major incident factor in the 0-5 months age group, *fall* and *asphyxia* incidents are of equal importance given that children in the upper side of the age group (4-5 months) are more mobile (pushing/pulling/turning) as part of their physical development.<sup>1</sup> Related to the data presented, Staff pointed out that whatever the performance requirement for stability becomes, it has to verify that the product does not facilitate a child to roll over to a face down position and/or against a side of the product.<sup>2</sup>

Some members stated that they performed small tests where they put an in-bed sleeper on a bed and they laid next to it. They mentioned that the sleeper tilted 5-6 degrees from horizontal with their weight on one of its side (the members were 180 and 220 lb.) Bassinet's standard ASTM F2194-16<sup>E1</sup> allows for a 7 degrees side-to-side angle from horizontal. They expressed they found a lot of variability in their results depending on how they laid next to the sleeper. One member stated that the stability requirement is difficult to develop because there is not much data to know what an unsafe product behaves like in order to design an adequate test that differentiates between

---

<sup>1</sup> In the bassinet's data presented, the top four incidents for children in the 0-5 months age group were: added bedding, falls, asphyxia, structural integrity. In the 6+ months age group, the top incidents were: falls, added bedding.

<sup>2</sup> In the bassinet's data presented, 17 out of the 24 incidents for asphyxia, in the 0-5 months age group, were children found face down or against a side. All 17 incidents resulted in death.

## **U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission LOG OF MEETING**

a safe and an unsafe product. During the discussion, other members stated that for the stability test, using an Infant CAMI may not be an adequate representation of an actual child because the limbs and structure of the CAMI may prevent it from rolling, even at high surface angles, which would invalidate the test. The TG then brainstormed the idea of swaddling the CAMI to keep the limbs from preventing the roll over. However, this would bring a lot of subjectivity between the labs in how to tightly swaddle the CAMI. Also, it would be difficult to standardize which type of swaddle to use given the variety of swaddles in the market (*e.g.* loose vs. tight legs.) Another challenging point is that children closer to the upper side of the age group (3-5 months old) are not swaddled, as their mobility increases, which would also invalidate the test. Some members agreed to conduct some research and experimentation to determine at what angle does the infant CAMI start to slide or rollover when put on an incline, with and without the swaddle.

At the conclusion of the meeting, one of the members expressed concern over putting a hard cutoff in terms of age group (in this case, 5 months old) for In-Bed sleepers since parents that bedshare will then put children directly on the bed once the children are beyond the cutoff age; now without the product to protect them. His concern has been shared in previous TG meetings.