

U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission LOG OF MEETING

SUBJECT: F15.21 Slings Carriers – Scope

DATE OF MEETING: 24 June 2021

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Hope E J. Nesteruk, ESMC

LOCATION: Teleconference

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Hope Nesteruk, ESMC; Suad Wanna-Nakamura, HSPP

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

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

The aim of this task group is to examine and potentially redefine/clarify the scope and definitions as outlined in the F2907-19 Sling Carrier standard as market developments have changed significantly in the past 10 years. Concerns have been expressed over the past several years that the scope is unclear.

One task group member, who makes shirts that hold infants, stated that she believes that she is outside the scope of this standard, and that redefining the scope of the standard is the wrong direction to go. The group discussed the history of F2907, which developed out of F2236 (soft infant and toddler carriers, SITCs), and the SITC standard felt that slings were so different they needed their own standard.

A task group member stated that the dynamic testing procedures imply that the standard is to facilitate mobility, therefore, products that are not for mobility, should not be included in the scope. Another member stated that including the weights in the scope means that they cannot make a carrier with a lower weight limit. One manufacturer explained that her concern is that placing a small, newborn infant in a carrier that is too large can be a hazard, and there is no testing for newborn carriers.

The term “unstructured” was raised as a potential confusing issue, as many carriers do provide some structure. In addition, garments are sized for the adult caregiver, while reducing the need for rings and buckles.

During the discussion, CPSC staff provided some historical information regarding the development of the scope, and in particular, the guidance noted in the scope.

One member brought up that the some of the warnings do not apply to garment products, which implies that they should not be within scope. CPSC staff asked if it was more appropriate to change a scope to match warnings or if warnings should change to match stated scope.

The test methods (including the dynamic test, which is based on walking) support that the intent was to cover mobility products. In addition, since the standard is for sling *carriers*, it implies that one is carrying the infant from one place to another.