

## U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission Log of Meeting

**SUBJECT:** WCMA Steering Committee Meeting

**DATE OF MEETING:** October 5, 2011

**LOCATION:** Kellen Company Offices, 750 National Press Building, Washington, DC

**LOG ENTRY SOURCE:** Rana Balci-Sinha

**DATE OF LOG ENTRY:** October 26, 2011

**CPSC ATTENDEES:** Rana Balci-Sinha, Human Factors  
Bob Ochsman, Human Factors  
Renaë Rauchschalbe, Compliance

**NON-CPSC ATTENDEES:**  
Rich Watkins, Comfortex  
Stephen Drew, Health Canada  
Joe Jankoski, Hunter Douglas  
Mark Johnson, Levolor  
Teri Williamson, Levolor (Newell)  
Derick Marsh, RollEase  
Tom Merker, Springs Window Fashions  
Michael Hollander, Whole Space Industries  
Ralph Vasami, WCMA  
Tim Bennett, WCMA  
Lisa Valenti, Beautiful Window, via teleconference  
Paul Ehrmann, Bureau Veritas, via teleconference  
Joe Kovach, Hunter Douglas, via teleconference  
Jim Anthony, Hunter Douglas, via teleconference  
Christopher Outlaw, Hunter Douglas, via teleconference  
Robert LeBlanc, Lewis Hyman Inc., via teleconference  
Joe Cannaverde, RollEase, via teleconference  
Jay Genzel, The Shade Store, via teleconference  
Erin Lin, Whole Space Industries, via teleconference  
Jackson Ko Whole Space Industries, via teleconference  
Mary Ann Plumlee Workroom Assn of America, via teleconference

### SUMMARY OF MEETING:

1. Tom Merker called the meeting to order. Ralph Vasami reviewed the antitrust rules. The log of the September 1st meeting was approved.

2. Appendix C Sub Group chair Rich Watkins provided updates. He offered a solution to the question raised in the previous meeting, namely how to test inner cords and cord shrouds, individually or as an assembly. Section C4.1 and the new proposed cord shroud accessibility probe (Figure C2) are proposed. If the cord shroud accessibility probe can be inserted without touching the shroud and the cord, then both will be tested individually in accordance with Appendix D. If the cord shroud accessibility probe can be inserted but comes in contact with both the cord and the shroud, or if it cannot be inserted at all, then the cords are tested as an assembly per Appendix D. Teri Williamson and Rana Balci-Sinha suggested that if the shroud accessibility probe comes in contact with the cord and shroud, then they should be tested independently. Derick Marsh stated that when the shade is raised, the inner cords come out and separate more, and therefore testing the shade only in fully lowered position may not be capturing the worst case scenario. It was agreed that the sub group would consider these two issues and come to a conclusion.
3. Appendix D sub group chair is now Jack Feng. Most of the work has been done, and no updates.
4. Continuous Loop sub group chair Joe Kovac provided updates. The sub group met a few times and decided to include the requirement of fasteners be provided by the manufacturer. Tension device warning tag (5.2.4) will be updated to ensure that consumers are informed that the provided fasteners may not be appropriate for their mounting surface.
5. Wide lift band sub group chair Joe Cannaverde provided updates and stated that there is a relation between stiffness & width and the resulting occlusion of the airway. The group will do more testing using various bands.
6. Labels and warnings team is working on an additional labeling in custom and stock products. The group created a label on product packaging that is currently under legal and expert reviews. Second area of exploration was to determine if consolidation of warning labels should be pursued. Due to the various different messages that are required for different cord types, the group decided not to consolidate.
7. The committee assigned a working group for roll up blinds. Roll up task group chair Robert Le Blanc just submitted a language for roll-up blinds breakaway testing. The technical committee members will review it.
8. The draft standard has been reviewed:
  - a) Steve Drew asked the reason of the term "flexible loops" on page 5, which only seems limited. Tom Merker will take this to the technical committee.
  - b) Mary Ann Plumlee asked the reason for the term "... in all reasonably foreseeable environments where young children are present". She suggested that this seems to put a lot of responsibility to the installers and dealers to determine "responsibly". Tom Merker will discuss with Ralph Vasami.
  - c) Steve Drew asked how to determine the accessibility for lead test. Tom Merker said that typically the bottom rail and PVC material are checked. Paul Ehrman suggested that guidance such as within 12" from the top rail exemption would be helpful. Tom Merker asked if only the major parts that are deemed accessible per Appendix C would be a reasonable approach and said that this issue will be considered by the technical committee.
9. Mary Ann Plumlee asked a question on the labeling (5.1.1) of the products without bottom rails such as in certain Roman Shades. She suggested that the back of the shade may not be visible to the consumer. Tom Merker will discuss with Ralph Vasami.
10. The labeling of the custom merchandising was discussed. It was suggested that the warnings can be on any document that the consumer reviews before making the purchasing decision. Rana balci-Sinha suggested that the wording on the warning labels in general can state "Children have STRANGLED" instead of using present tense. Joe Kovac suggested that every scenario has to be considered. Tom Merker will take the issue to the technical committee.

11. Rana Balci-Sinha will provide the references for the values suggested by CPSC. She also suggested that a Rationale section at the end of the standard can include all the references.
12. Regarding a question on the review and approval of the draft standard, Tim Bennett stated that unlike the provisional process, technical committee has to “resolve” every comment. He said that officially the final and approved standard has to be in place in September 2012 and he suspects that a 6-month-duration may be needed for the association to go through all nine steps in the ANSI process for the standard to be approved.
13. Next meeting is scheduled for October 27<sup>th</sup> via teleconference.
14. Meeting was adjourned.