U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
Log of Meeting

SUBJECT: WCMA Steering Committee Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: April 27, 2011

LOCATION: Las Vegas Convention Center, NV

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Rana Balci-Sinha

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: May 19, 2011

CPSC ATTENDEES: Renae Rauchschwalbe, Compliance
Rana Balci-Sinha, Human Factors
Bob Ochsman, Human Factors (via teleconference)
Matt Howsare, Chief of Staff to the Chairman

NON-CPSC ATTENDEES:

Siliva Madera All Strong
Dave Perkowitz B & W
Lynn J Alstadt BIR
Jeff Sendlak Bureau Veritas
Rich Watkins Comfortex
Rachel Weintraub Consumer Federation (via teleconference)
Tyler Goodier Health Canada (via teleconference)
Stephen Drew Health Canada
Joe Jankoski Hunter Douglas
Jim Anthony Hunter Douglas
Joe Kovach Hunter Douglas
Chris Outlaw Hunter Douglas
Michael Cienian Hunter Douglas
Courtney Hopkins Kenney Manufacturing
Carolyn Martin Kenney Manufacturing
Jack Feng Levolor Kirsch
Mark Johnson Levolor Kirsch
Teresa Williamson Levolor Kirsch
Joe Yankello Levolor Kirsch
Robert LeBlanc Lewis Hyman Inc.
Tripp Hornick Louis Hornick & Company
Steve Birtles Louvolite
Linda Kaiser Parents for Window Blind Safety (via teleconference)
Joe Cannaverde RollEase
Derick Marsh RollEase
William Taylor Rowley Company
Bill Vestal Safe-T-Shade
Steve Gibbons Safe-T-Shade
1) Tom Merker called the meeting to order. Ralph Vasami reviewed the antitrust rules.
2) Task groups gave an update on the status of their work.
3) The accessibility task group:
   a. A new requirement associated with inner cords is proposed: “The product shall have inner cords which are enclosed within the body of the product and are at least 6” from the edge, where the opening is not large enough to allow passage of the head probe (16.6” circumference) as referenced in Appendix D.” This definition was considered in lieu of the previously proposed sharp point test probe. CPSC staff noted that the Roman shades that may have inner cords that fit into the above definition would now be acceptable even though they do not have a similar safety margin compared to the other types of window coverings such as cellular shades. CPSC staff will review the new definition and provide feedback.

4) Health Canada asked the steering committee to consider changing the continuous loop and individual operating cord working group’s charters to prioritize requirements that would make cords inaccessible, thereby eliminating the hazard rather than developing solutions to protect against the hazards. Linda Kaiser agreed with the approach.

5) The goal of the standard revision effort has been debated as to elimination or minimization of the hazards.

6) Hazardous Loop task group:
   a. Removed the entanglement test.
   b. Working on developing a safe distance between the inner cords of Top-Down-Bottom-Up shades such that the distance will be either narrow not to allow a child’s head to enter or large enough that a head probe can get in and out.

7) Linda Kaiser asked if the roll-up shades are being a part of the standard revision activity and if so where it will fit. Tom Merker asked if roll-up shades should have a separate section instead of being part of Appendix A. Appendix C accessibility task group would need to include roll-up shades because the extent of the section covers all cords. Consideration of release devices for roll-up shades has been discussed.

8) Continuous loop and bead chain task group:
a. Proposed language to add performance/durability requirements for the tension devices was reviewed. These tests include cycle testing, impact testing, accelerated UV testing and cord pull-out testing.

b. Various parties brought up the issue of uncontrollability of the mounting surfaces for external tension devices. Linda Kaiser noted that in a VA incident a child pulled out the tension device from the wall and put the loop around his neck. Some manufacturers stated that the uninstalled tension devices make the product inoperable therefore should get the attention of the caregiver to fix it. Rachel Weintraub noted that there is confusion about operability of the product versus its posing a hazard.

c. Steve Birtles noted that breakaway devices that are part of the continuous loop could be used as a secondary protection system in case the loop comes off the wall. The devices have been in the UK market for the last 5-7 years with no reported incidents.

d. Tyler Goodier asked for more detailed incident data from Europe. Steve Birtles stated that he would contact the CEN group to see if data is available to review.

e. The issue of adding a pull-out test from the wall was discussed and the working group will develop language covering different wall configurations and attachment hardware for the Steering Committee to review.

9) Operating cords task group:
   a. Reviewed the logic tree: if the product has exposed and un-tensioned operating cords and is used for window lower than TBD inches from finished floor (measured to the top of the window sill); with one strand, it should pass App E (wrap around with a TBD min breakaway force); with two or more strands it should first pass App A or App F (TBD unintended loop formation test), and then single strand App E test.

10) Wide lift band task group:
   a. The working group proposed a “matrix” approach for wide lift bands that would depend on the width of the band and the stiffness of the material. Intertek testing will provide assessment data for the group to use in constructing the matrix.

11) Labels and Hangtags task group:
   a. The group will begin to review the possibility of consolidation of labels within the standard. A request was made to harmonize labels and warnings with Health Canada. Warning labels on stock retail packaging will be included.

12) Next meeting will be held in Washington, DC on May 25th, 2011. The purpose is to review the draft language of the standard.