



## MEETING LOG

**SUBJECT:** ASTM F15.16 Infant Feeding Supports Subcommittee

**FY 23 OP PLAN ENTRY:** Infant Support Pillows and Nursing Support Products

**DATE OF MEETING:** 11/3/2023

**LOCATION OF MEETING:** Virtual

**CPSC STAFF FILING MEETING LOG:** Tim Smith (ESHF)

**FILING DATE:** 11/8/2023

**CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** Tim Smith (ESHF), Mark Eilbert (LSM), Ashley Johnson (HSPP), Celestine Kish (ESHF), Stefanie Marques (HSPP), Susan Proper (EC), and Suad Wanna-Nakamura (HSPP)

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

### Summary of Meeting:

This meeting of the ASTM Infant Feeding Supports subcommittee was led by the co-chair of the subcommittee, Jessica Doyle. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the results of the recently balloted draft standard. After briefly summarizing the negatives and comments received on the ballot item, the subcommittee walked through the draft standard, which included some of the co-chair's proposed revisions to address the issues raised in the comments. The topics of discussion included the following:

- **Section 1, Scope:** The subcommittee discussed whether this section should continue to include a list of products that are excluded from the scope of the standard. Some members stated that the list is not exhaustive and should not be included, while others stated that the products that are identified were as identified by the Scope and Terminology task group as the ones where there might be confusion. One member suggested that an improved definition for "infant feeding supports" would likely address any confusion, and the co-chair stated that the definition has been revised to be consistent with the definition in CPSC's proposed rule.
- **Section 3, Terminology:** This section includes revisions to the "infant feeding supports" definition (referenced above) and a new definition for "infant restraint system."
- **Section 6, Performance Requirements:** These sections include revisions to clarify that prohibited restraint systems are "infant" restraint systems, that the tension test applies to "seams," and added pass-fail criteria based, in part, on the proposed rule.
- **Section 7, Test Methods:** Most of the discussion of this section focused on the firmness test method. The draft standard included numerous revisions based on the standalone firmness test method that



currently is being balloted, the test method in the draft Infant Loungers standard, and the proposed rule. The subcommittee, and CPSC staff, discussed some details of the test method that appeared to be in error. The co-chair stated that she intends to schedule a performance requirements task group meeting in the next couple weeks to address these issues. The subcommittee also discussed the idea of the draft standard referencing the standalone infant firmness test method, once it has been published, rather than repeating the language of the test method in each standard to which it applies. The co-chair showed a change to a figure in the occupant entrapment test to clarify the portion of the probe that, if contacted, would constitute a failure.

- *Section 8, Marking and Labeling:* The co-chair noted that there were several comments on the required warnings, but that the draft standard would rely on the version in the proposed rule. There was a brief discussion surrounding use of the term “kill,” with some stating that they would prefer the phrase, “can cause death.” CPSC staff also pointed out that the sections referenced in the package warnings should be citing the product warning format requirements, not the product warning content requirements.
- *Section 9, Instructional Literature:* CPSC staff pointed out an error in a section number referenced within the draft standard, and there was a brief discussion about whether the format requirements should apply to all cautionary and warning information in instructional literature, or just the warnings specified in the standard. Staff noted that the intent of the language was to apply the format requirements to all hazard cautionary and warning information.
- *Appendix X1, Rationale:* One member identified several concerns about the rationales included in this section, and the co-chair stated that she will work on this section for the next draft.

### **Next Steps:**

The co-chair intends to schedule a performance requirements task group meeting in a couple weeks, and the next subcommittee meeting is scheduled for November 30, at ASTM Headquarters.