SUMMARY OF MEETING:

1) Prior to the meeting, CPSC staff and Ralph Vasami met regarding the letter that was sent a day prior from the Assistant Executive Director of the Office of Hazard Identification and Reduction at CPSC.
Staff reiterated the concerns outlined in the letter. Note that the letter was directly addressed to Ralph Vasami and was not included as an agenda item for the steering committee meeting.

2) Tom Merker called the meeting to order. Ralph Vasami reviewed the antitrust rules.
3) Task groups gave an update on the status of their work.
4) The accessibility task group:
   a. Task group stated that a new probe using the median age of a child (23 months) involved in incidents did not differ from the accessibility probe, and their definition of exposed versus enclosed cords would still be preferred. Rana proposed a new approach that takes into consideration of the actions that a child would perform to reach and pull out a cord within an enclosure. The opening should be large enough to accommodate those hand positions. Accessibility group will review the proposal. Rana is to provide feedback on the distance from the edge, based on anthropometric dimensions. The accessibility group's currently proposed distance is 6 inches.
   b. Stephen asked which cords are being checked with App C. Rich responded that the test procedure is not intended for cords that are used to operate the cord.
5) Hazardous Loop task group:
   a. Group is reviewing the following three concerns:
      i. What directions should be pursued if the cord can be pulled from all directions?
      ii. Concern about applying multiple pulls to the same cord.
      iii. What happens if the mounting block (for two hooks) cannot access the cord completely?
6) Continuous loop and bead chain task group:
   a. Will specify a pull-out test based on common applications and attached hardware.
   b. Tom received data from UK. He stated that there were 23 fatalities between 1996 and 2011. He counted 5 roller shades, 3 vertical shades, 1 horizontal shade, 2 Roman (or Roll-up) shades, 1 probably not a window covering, and 11 unknown types associated with incidents. Based on his review, there appears to be 10 incidents associated with continuous loops.
   c. Jim Anthony showed an example of an anchor that can withstand up to 65 lbs of pull force in a drywall setting.
   d. Stephen indicated that the tension device installation is still consumer dependent and safety devices should not be installer/consumer dependent. He indicated that the scenario also assumes that there is a mounting surface available.
   e. Bob stated that the gold standard is that as soon as installer or consumer installs the window covering via the head rail, safety sub-system should be operative.
   f. Tom indicated that a secondary safety system will be considered.
7) Operating cords task group:
   a. Reviewed the updated logic tree.
   b. The group is waiting for the Intertek results to go forward. The study will look at the various cord materials that were submitted by manufacturers and determine what cord characteristics are considered safe. The results are expected by mid-July.
   c. Stephen asked about the cord connectors, which create a loop when pulled down to raise the shade. Jack responded saying that the breakaway test procedure would be employed.
8) Wide lift band task group:
   a. Intertek received six types of materials and will determine the characteristics to define a wide band.
9) Labels and Hangtags task group:
   a. May look at the pictograms as well as consolidation of labels.
10) The committee reviewed the proposed draft language of the standard. Major highlights/changes are as follows: the tension device pull-out test will probably include specific mounting surfaces such as drywall, drywall backed wood, wood, metal, and concrete. Appendix C should include both fully lowered and raised position of the window covering so that the cords which may be inaccessible in fully lowered position but are accessible in raised position are categorized as accessible and tested accordingly. Section 4.3.2. that states “The product shall have one or more separate operating cords” will refer to Appendices E & F (Wrap Around and Unintended Loop). Section 4.3.9 regarding cord connectors should be subject to applicable test procedures when the shade is raised. Inner cord or operating cord/loop shroud devices should be subject to similar tests such as hazardous loop determination. Section 5 on labeling will have requirements associated with on-the-package warnings.

11) Next meeting will likely take place on July 14th so that the results from Intertek studies can be discussed. Location TBD.

12) Meeting was adjourned.