

## MEETING LOG

**PRODUCT:** Toys

**SUBJECT:** ANSI ISO/TC 181 US TAG

**LOCATION:** Teleconference

**DATE:** 10/4/22

**ENTRY DATE:** 10/31/22

**LOG ENTRY SOURCE:** Benjamin Mordecai

**COMMISSION ATTENDEES:** Benjamin Mordecai, Jill Hurley

**NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:** *Contact Joan Lawrence for attendee list*

**MEETING SUMMARY:** The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the US's position on interpretations of ISO 8124 involving several different types of toys. This is a continuation of the meeting, which took place on 8/18/22.

The new ISO standard, ISO 8124:2022, has just been published. The first toy product discussed was "sticky hands." The question raised was whether the U.S. TAG felt they should fall within the scope and requirements of yo-yo balls. The group identified a number of reasons why these products should not, namely that these products do not meet the definition, have an entirely different play pattern, and do not appear to present the same risks. The second product is referred to as "Ants in the Pants." The question was raised whether this product is considered a projectile toy. The consensus is that it is a projectile toy, and not ground based. For home and public playground equipment, as it stands, there is no differentiation between home and public playground equipment in ISO 8124. The group proposed to amend clause 1(d) and change "public" to "home." The third toy product was ride-on toys and stationary seats. The question raised was about fore and aft stability and how to determine where the rider cannot easily use his/her legs for stability for testing. For the fore and aft stability tests, the group discussed that the rider's legs must be completely unrestricted and proposed to amend clause 4.15.1.3 to 1) further define "unrestricted," 2) consider an age threshold, and 3) the effective use of the feet to stabilize a rearward tip over. The fourth toy product discussed was scooters and how to apply the downward force on the steering tube during testing. The group proposed to apply it axially to the steering tube and not vertically downward relative to the scooter. The group proposed to clarify 5.29.1, add a separate test for steering tubes, which are not perpendicular to the scooter deck, and to consider whether the evaluation criteria for both 5.29 and the proposed additional test should be

expanded to cover situations such as fracture of the scooter body. The final topic of discussion was the compression test. The questions raised were clarifications on the applicability of the test in situations where a curved surface, which is accessible to a child and non-accessible to the flat contact surface of the compression disk. Similarly, whether a surface with a minor dimension of 30 mm and major dimension more than 30 mm, which is accessible to a child and non-accessible to the flat contact surface be subjected to the compression test. The group agreed that in both situations, the test would be applicable and that no action should be taken.