

FTC Care Labeling Rule Roundtable
March 28, 2014
Segment 4
Transcript

AMANDA KOSTNER: I'm Amanda Kostner with the Federal Trade Commission. Robert Frisby will also be assisting with this panel. And this is the discussion on care symbols. We have six issues on the agenda today. We plan to roughly allocate about 10 minutes per issue, and leaving Q&A time at the end.

I'd like to introduce our roundtable participants. We have Marie D'Avignon with American Apparel and Footwear, Richard Fitzpatrick with Chrysler Inc, Adam Mansell with the UK Fashion and Textile Association, Charles Riggs from Texas Woman's University, Mary Scalco with the Dry Cleaning and Laundry Institute, Peters Sinshemer from UCLA Sustainable Technology and Policy Program, Stacy Sopcich from Green Earth Cleaning, and Alan Spielvogel from the National Cleaners Association. Thank you all for participating.

Our first topic of discussion today regards the differences between the ASTM and ISO symbols. As you know, the prior rule allowed only use of ASTM. The Commission now proposes to use both ASTM and ISO care systems. The Commission seeks input on whether consumers will be deceived or confused by some of the differences between these two care systems. And we've identified a number of different differences.

The first is the maximum treatment. Under ISO, a care symbol designates the maximum treatment that can be applied to a textile. This is in contrast to the ASTM system where a care symbol does not necessarily indicate the maximum treatment, and I'd like to hear any input on what impact this has on consumers and/or impact on manufacturers.

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: My opinion on this is there's really no standard on care labeling because each country has-- there's European. There's ISO. There's the ASTM. There's also Asian care symbols.

And what happens is there's a lot of confusion on how to process the garment and what the consumer could expect out of the garment and how to process it. And I think if there's one set of care symbols, and it's a standard, I think it would be a good idea. It would make it easier for the consumer and the dry cleaner.

What we've been seeing is that you'll see a lot of care symbols in different languages, different symbols, and you end up having a garment that contains five or six care symbols. It's like a little book, and what the consumer does is they end up taking out of the garment because they can't wear it. So I think if we went to symbols, I think it would be easier for the consumer, and it would set a standard throughout the world. I think that's make things easier for everybody involved.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Does anyone else on the panel-- Adam?

ADAM MANSELL: On the particular issue of the maximum optimum treatment, that's an issue for the manufacture retailer, the person who's putting the garment on the market. What happens, they'll have no impact whatsoever on the consumer. The consumer would just follow whatever information is on that garment, so if it's been tested to 6330 or whatever the US equivalent is, then it would be safe to launder at home or dry clean or whatever else it might be. So I don't think that particular issue would have any significant impact.

CHARLES RIGGS: I was on both the ISO committees and the ASTM committees, and the difference on the maximum was not in the symbols. It was complying with FTC rule, because the FTC rule did not require the maximum. And lo and behold, change and approach and would address another issue of low labelling, which has been a common issue following the FTC rules because we have manufacturers who will not put the harshest conditions. They will put something less than the harshest conditions because, indeed, the garment performs better.

But in terms of getting it clean, the maximum condition would be preferred, but you could do the maximum regardless of whether you're using the ISO symbols or the ASTM symbols. I don't think-- that's not a difference built into the symbols. The symbols, I think, are the same except for the Natural Dry.

ADAM MANSELL: Depending on which version of--

CHARLES RIGGS: Yeah, depending on which version. The last version I saw was a committee draft, and I would have to buy a new version. I didn't do that. You can work on the committee, and you get drafts, but you don't get the final copy.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Well, natural drying is my next question for the panel, but is there anyone else who had a comment on the maximum treatment?

MARY SCALCO: Well, I guess it's not really on the maximum treatment, but you asked if having the two symbol systems-- the differences would have an impact on consumers. Consumers don't understand either of the systems. So depending on what education FTC was going to do to educate consumers on the symbol system, now you have to educate them to two symbol systems, not one symbol system, because I would venture to say that most consumers don't know care symbols, period. So if you want them to recognize the difference, you would have to educate them to both systems.

ADAM MANSELL: If I could-- one more comment. Although the ISO absolutely does talk about maximum treatment, it has, in no way, removed the same issue that Charles was talking about, about underlabeling. You get underlabeling throughout Europe and the rest of world, where the ISO applies. Just because it's got that statement in it doesn't mean that everybody absolutely follows it.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Right. Richard?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: In terms of the care providers, I mean, the world's getting smaller and smaller, and more and more of our clients are coming in with textiles that they purchased

overseas that simply have ISO labels already in them. They still need to be serviced. The cleaner needs to be able to process them in their best possible way with some reasonable guideline. I think Alan mentioned there's no standards in the industry in terms of what's maximum and what's minimum, and it can vary from facility to facility.

So I think that having both sets, or allowing both sets, would allow garment manufacturers in Europe to be able to sell in the United States without having to manage two different types of care labels. It'll allow the cleaning providers some reliability in terms of how they can process the work. In terms of the underlabeling or maximum, things like that, I don't think it's going to come into so much play with the care of the garment because the dry cleaner's going to process it with whatever standard formulas they have in their machines.

AMANDA KOSTNER: All right.

CHARLES RIGGS: I don't think it's as much an issue with the professional cleaners as it would be the consumer. You know, the consumer gets something that says hand wash, cold water. The professional might recognize it as a low label, but the consumer thinks that's what they have to do with it.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Consumers are always going to be confused over these labels. I mean, I don't think we can correct that.

CHARLES RIGGS: But I think our intent here-- I mean, this whole labeling requirement is for consumer benefit. Right?

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yes.

CHARLES RIGGS: So I think we have to look more in terms of how the consumer views what they're seeing then how the professional. You know, the professional's going to be up another level of knowledge. But I can tell you consumers, and I'm talking about freshman, sophomore college students who are fashion design, fashion merchandising textuals majors so should know more, they don't understand them either.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Well, I'd like to move on to the issue of the difference between the natural drying symbols with ISO and ASTM. And when the commission proposed changes to the care labeling rule, ISO 2005 was in effect, so we are addressing ISO 2005 with these differences. Some of the differences are-- there's a Do Not Ring symbol in ASTM, and ISO doesn't have this.

There's a different number of symbols. ASTM has more symbols than ISO, and in ASTM, the symbol for medium temperature drying means normal temperature drying in the ISO system. So again, what are the impacts on consumers, and what are the impacts on manufacturers with these differences?

MARY SCALCO: Well, in terms of the manufacturers-- and if this was me, and I was a clothing manufacturer, first problem I would have is that you're referring to a standard that's not the

current standard. So I would be using the current standard. I would not be going back to 2005. I would be doing whatever the 2012 was. So that would be the first problem for a manufacturer.

Consumers, again-- I go back. They don't understand what they mean anyway, so I mean, ring you can pretty much figure out. It looks like ring. But the box with the lines on it-- I'm not sure anybody's going to understand what that means anyway.

CHARLES RIGGS: And-- excuse me. Mary, I think the new ISO natural dry symbols are quite different than the 2005 ones. 2005 is more in a line with ASTM, and this has always been an issue if you adopt ASTM or ISO or both because FTC wants to keep control of changes in the symbols. And so if you adopt an organization's symbols, and they're going to change them, and then FTC loses control of the process. So that's part of the issue.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I'd agree with Mary, very much so, the fact that we're looking at the 2005 and not the most recent standard is a big problem. But for manufacturers in today's supply chain, they're not making products for just one market. Very, very rarely does that happen, so being able to use both sets of standards or some kind of harmonization of the standards, whatever we decide might be best, would benefit manufacturers immensely.

ADAM MANSELL: I totally support that comment. Just coming back to the consumer comprehension of the symbols, I said it earlier, if we're talking about the consumers, there's really only three, possibly four of the symbols that make any difference to them at all. One is the washtub, and absolutely everybody knows what the washtub means. Certainly within Europe, and I'm sure it's the same in the States. The iron symbol is the only one that actually looks like anything that you're going to do, so everyone understands what the iron symbol is.

The dry cleaning, professional cleaning, we talked about this morning, and then the tumble dry one. The bleaching one-- frankly, I don't think anybody understand what the bleaching symbol is, and they're never going to because it's not a very intuitive process. So I don't think there would be a particular issue with consumer comprehension in terms of the washing, the ironing, and the professional care symbols. That's my personal view. But coming back to the more general point, I think if we can have a system where the two major markets in the world have the same general approach to labeling, I think it'll be a huge difference to manufacturers in these areas.

AMANDA KOSTNER: And I wanted to identify one other difference between the two systems, and Professor Riggs touched on this earlier. It's an ISO. They use the Saint Andrew's Cross, and that does not require a reasonable basis, as opposed to ASTM. If you use a do-not language, you do have to have a reasonable basis. Again, input on what impact this has on consumers, what impact this has on manufacturers, and does the FTC need to do something to make people understand this difference.

STACY SOPCICH: Are you suggesting that the FTC would no longer require a reasonable basis with an ISO standard? Is that what you're asking?

AMANDA KOSTNER: No, I'm just asking-- the FTC has proposed the use of the ISO standard, so how do we harmonize? If you're using the ISO system, and you want to use a do-not construction, but ISO doesn't require the reasonable basis?

ADAM MANSELL: I think you've gone two steps ahead of where you need to be. If the FTC rule is that you need to prove reasonable basis, then that's the FTC rule. So it's up to the supplier to make sure that they have the Saint Andrew's Cross on it, that they have complied with the FTC rule.

Just because-- bear in mind that the ISO 3758 standard is just about the graphical symbols. That's all it's about. So if there is a requirement within the US that says you have to provide reasonable evidence, then you have to provide reasonable evidence. It makes no difference what it says in 3758. I don't see the two being contradictory in this instance at all.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yes?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Well, if the rule is changed to allow both ISO and ASTM standards, then doesn't that automatically include the fact that, if it's an ISO labeled ISO, that they don't need to have reasonable.

ADAM MANSELL: No, because you're selling in to the State-- you're selling into the US, and the US requirement is you have to have reasonable proof. That bit doesn't change.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I agree, actually, with Adam. I would think that the underlying symbol would be the thing that would be recognized in both places, but the rules as to whether or not the symbol can be cross out is completely separate from the symbol looks like.

CHARLES RIGGS: That's the same logic what the maximum criteria, too. We're using the same symbol, but I think the bigger issue is, as these symbols begin to change, either ASTM doing the changing or ISO doing the changing, and we're base this on an older version that's no longer current, how do we update it to the current versions? FTC loses control of the process if you just blindly say most recent standard from ASTM or most recent standard from ISO.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Well, the FTC would have to go through another proposed NPRM to incorporate the new ISO standard. That's the processes that the FTC has to follow to keep up with the ever-changing standards.

MARY SCALCO: I think-- I mean, I don't mean to criticize the FTC, but I think you just added a level of deception to the whole process because now you've got the consumer working off of whatever the most current standard is, the manufacturer working off the most current standard, but the FTC is on a standard that's five years ago. So I don't know how, as a consumer, what do I do?

AMANDA KOSTNER: This is an important topic. Unfortunately, it is not for this panel. We will be able to discuss this and ways the FTC can keep up with the different rules in the third panel if

need be, but I'm going to move on to the next topic at this point, and that is whether to require that labels identify the ISO system if used.

So right now, the Commission's proposal is that if you use the ASTM symbols, you do not have to say that you are using the ASTM symbols. If you use ISO, the proposal is that you would have to say this is the ISO system. My first question to the panel is to what extent do care labels currently use ASTM or ISO symbols? Does anyone--

MARY SCALCO: I would have to ask some of the manufacturers in the audience. Maybe they have an idea of how many--

AMANDA KOSTNER: Does anyone know percentage of labels that do use symbols?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Is your question just how many garments come with symbols as opposed to written instructions?

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yes.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: And whether they're ASTM or ISO?

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yes.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: I would say the majority of textiles come with symbols of some sort as part of the care labeling.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I would just amend that to say that I believe I wouldn't say the majority use symbols instead of, but the majority use symbols either, instead of or in addition to. Most companies use the words and the symbols.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Yes.

AMANDA KOSTNER: OK. Are they ISO or ASTM?

MARIE D'AVIGNON: Depends on-- I mean, the ones I see the US are usually ASTM because it's the US, but--

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: For the most part, the ASTM.

CHARLES RIGGS: I've never seen the symbols identified on the label, whether they're ASTM or ISO.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Well, so that was my next question. When symbols are being used, does anyone have evidence, anecdotal or otherwise-- do they see that it says ASTM? Does it say ISO?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: I definitely think if you purchase garments in Europe, the care label will state ISO on--

STACY SOPCICH: No.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: They don't? Well, then I've seen ISO on garments sold in the US from European manufacturers with that.

STACY SOPCICH: But if you get back to consumer protection, I think the key issue is whether or not the symbol has a different meaning under the two standards, and if it has a different meaning, then it makes logical sense that you might need to identify it. But for the most part, most of the symbols mean exactly the same thing. It's just very few.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I agree. I mean, there's slight differences, but it's never a case where a square here means one thing, and it's different in another country. It's still going to be a square. And it might have two dots or a 68, but it still means the same thing. And consumers are going to understand that square means the same thing wherever it is.

CHARLES RIGGS: I don't think normal versus medium is an issue. I know that's--

AMANDA KOSTNER: OK.

CHARLES RIGGS: There is an issue that-- well, I'm not sure it's ever been openly discussed, so maybe I'll throw the gauntlet and ask it be brought to the board and put Adam on the spot. That is some of these symbols are copyrighted, and I'm not sure what's involved with the manufacturers and costs for use of going to ASTM versus ISO, which has some Genentech's symbols in it. And I know Adam has history with Genentech and might address it. In luncheon discussions, we would talk about fees to use and the meaning of the copyright and so on, but in the panels, it never was discussed, and I think it needs to be.

Are there underlying costs associated if a manufacturer chooses to use ISO symbol sets? I believe with ASTM, there's not, but you've got to buy the standard. With ISO, I think depending on where you market it, I'll let Adam bring up the response, there may be additional fees involved per label. Please, Adam.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yes, that is my next question. And just remember, the use of symbols is always optional. You're not required to use symbols under the FTC rule, but should a manufacturer decide to use the ISO system, does the manufacturer incur additional costs?

ADAM MANSELL: Depends where they're selling. If they're using them in the US, then absolutely not. The only time that anybody is required to pay a license fee is if they are selling a garment into a country where the symbols are trademarked, and the symbols are not trademarked in the US, so you can use them free of charge. They're not trademarked in the UK either. You can use them free of charge in the UK.

They are trademarked in most mainland Europe. I think the trademark covers about 40-odd countries in total, but that trademark is only properly policed in mainland Europe. The fees that you pay in mainland Europe depend on the particular market you're selling into, and this would have-- irrespective of whether the FTC decides to adopt the ISO symbols or not, this situation

that I'm explaining will still occur. So if you're selling into most of mainland Europe, you have to pay a license fee.

That license fee depends on which country you're selling into. It can either be per garment, or it can be an overarching fee. If anybody wants to talk to me about how the UKFT could help them, I'd be more than happy to do so, but it's probably inappropriate for this particular panel discussion.

CHARLES RIGGS: It is being recorded, Adam.

AMANDA KOSTNER: So my next question is under the Commission's proposal, using ISO, you would have to disclose it as the manufacturer. So my question is should this recommendation go forward, that if you decide to use ISO, you must somewhere disclose that you're using the ISO system?

ADAM MANSELL: Can I just-- what benefit would that give the consumer? Because the consumer isn't going to know ISO 3758 or ASTM or anything else.

ROBERT FRISBY: In the Commission, I noticed a proposed rule-making. It indicated that there might be a difference because consumers might be more used to ASTM, it having been permissible for over 10 years, and that was the reason for proposing it. But we want to hear if it's a bad idea. We'd like to hear from you all.

ADAM MANSELL: Again, my personal view is that it's unnecessary. A washtub-- the ASTM and the washtub and the ISO are so similar. I don't think that it would be an issue.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Anyone else?

STACY SOPCICH: I agree. I think it's common sense that, if you're protecting the consumer, you would only need to identify them if there's a completely different meaning to the symbol. Otherwise, I don't see the value for the consumer in that.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: Agree, as well.

AMANDA KOSTNER: And if the commission decided that the 10 years of experience with ASTM warranted that ISO be disclosed, does the panel have any suggestions for what language the Commission could use to disclose use of ISO?

MARIE D'AVIGNON: Can you say that again?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: It's simply stating that these are ISO care instructions, is really all that's required. So I don't think you have to go into a lot of detail on a care label of what that means.

AMANDA KOSTNER: OK. Anyone else?

CHARLES RIGGS: The big difference, probably, is the use of the Saint Andrew's Cross, and probably most consumers are going to read that as don't do that. Whether there's a reasonable basis or not, they won't know. They'll just not do that.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: But again, does that hurt the consumer--

CHARLES RIGGS: No, that's what I mean. I mean, they don't know whether it's a reasonable action or not. They just won't do it, which is probably the right action anyway. For example, I know in the ISO system, you would routinely x out Do Not Dry Clean for underwear without testing it, and who would dry clean their underwear anyway?

AMANDA KOSTNER: On that note, I will be moving on to the third set of issues, and this is some of the differences between the 2005 and 2012 ISO symbols. So there are differences in the natural drying symbols, bleaching, and some of the professional textile care. Do Not Professional Wet Clean was added in 2012. That was not there in the 2005.

So as I mentioned, right now, the rule is written to ISO 2005. Mary mentioned that consumers and manufacturers and dry cleaners possibly are looking to the 2012 rule. The changes between the 2005 and 2012 rule, are these significant enough that they would have an impact on consumers, manufacturers, cleaners?

MARY SCALCO: Well, I mean, and maybe I didn't-- you just said the 2005 does not have a wet cleaning symbol, right?

ADAM MANSELL: A Do Not Wet Clean.

AMANDA KOSTNER: A Do Not Wet Clean.

ADAM MANSELL: It has a permissible wet clean, but not a Do Not Wet Clean symbol.

MARY SCALCO: So you can't put the cross over the--

ADAM MANSELL: If you use the 2005, but you can if you use the 2012.

CHARLES RIGGS: In the 2005, and I'm not sure it's in the '12 or not, but I remember very clearly that the European ISO was a basic five-symbol set. And the professional care was mandated to be a dry cleaning instruction, and the wet clean was optional. So it became a six-symbol or a second line, and so originally, it wasn't necessarily. Now, if we require a wet clean label, which I hope we don't, we would have to have the ability to cross it out.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Would the use of words remedy that issue?

CHARLES RIGGS: Well, words defeat the purpose of using the symbols. Right? It concerns me, and I don't know what happened except that the US delegation wasn't there. The 2005 ISO and the ASTM were the most-- were the two that were harmonized the best. That is, most of the symbols were identical, if not easily interpreted one to the other. In the 2012, suddenly the

natural dry symbols, I think, switched from being in harmony with ASTM to, I think, being in harmony with the Japanese system.

ADAM MANSELL: No, no, it being in harmony with absolutely nothing at all with the rest of the world.

CHARLES RIGGS: And it's worried me why they switched because we were in harmony at one point, which was our goal, and then for some reason, it intentionally went out of harmony. I wasn't there, and as far as I know, the US delegation in general didn't have travel funds and wasn't there.

ADAM MANSELL: The US delegation was there when we voted on the new version and on natural drying. There were only two countries that voted against the changes to natural drying, and that was the US and the UK.

[AUDIENCE LAUGHS]

I will put this on the record because it is actually-- it's a flippant point, but it's quite an important point. What happened within the ISO discussions was that, and excuse me for those of you that are technical in the room, the technicians in the room took over the debate, so common sense was left behind. And I think it's something that you need to be aware of when you have these discussions, is that you need to make sure that common sense prevails.

AMANDA KOSTNER: So is there any reason not to adopt the ISO 2012 rule at some point? I see head shakes from my court reporter. Does anyone want to speak up why they think it should eventually be adopted, ISO 2012?

STACY SOPCICH: No, there's no reason why it shouldn't.

CHARLES RIGGS: Well, isn't the '12 the one that has the different natural dry symbols than the ASTM?

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yes.

CHARLES RIGGS: Yeah, we go from being in harmony with ASTM, either symbol set could be recognized with a consumer, to suddenly something new and different for 2012 that doesn't harmonize. So, yeah, I think--

ADAM MANSELL: If I just-- the only thing I just add to that is, although the natural drying symbols have been in the ISO since 2012, I have yet to see a single garment in Europe that uses them because natural drying, unless you live in a very, very, very hot country and the sun might bleach your garments, natural drying, with one or two exceptions, won't damage your garment. So there's just not used.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Any other comments on this issue? All right, I'd next like to get input on some of the changes to the ASTM system, specifically the change in the meaning of circle-P. So

the old circle-P, which is just the circle with a P in it, meant that you could dry clean with any solvent except PERC.

CHARLES RIGGS: No. That's not what it meant.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Any solvent but trichlorethylene.

AMANDA KOSTNER: OK, any solvent except trichlorethylene.

CHARLES RIGGS: Which basically no longer exists as a solvent anyway.

AMANDA KOSTNER: OK. And under the revised standard, the symbol means to dry clean with, I believe, PERC or petroleum. Is that correct?

CHARLES RIGGS: I believe, according to the test method, and I think that's where we've got to go back to, ISO 3175 views PERC as being the most aggressive solvent. So to pass the test for PERC, any of the less aggressive solvents can also be used, which would include, as far as I know, anything out there, including the ones we currently don't recognize like Green Earth, dibutoxymethane, K4, on and on and on and on. I believe all of those would be compatible in that system with P.

When you go to the other symbol, the F, that would exclude perchloroethylene because that's a milder test method, and PERC will not pass the symbol test where you would use the F. So you're basically saying, with the F, don't use PERC. Use anything else. With the P, you're saying use anything, or that we know of right now. Alan, is that your understanding?

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: Yeah. It's also an issue with this P as far as getting solvents that are less aggressive than PERC, making PERC the standard. A lot of the solvents out now, alternates to PERC, are heating the solvents, which make them aggressive, and sometimes as aggressive as PERC between the heating of the solvent. And also the drying temperatures was also aggressive as the garments heat up. So I think that's something that has to be looked at, and most of the dry cleaning machines now, non-PERC dry cleaning machines, are being sold as solvent heaters, so it doesn't necessarily make PERC the benchmark of what's the most aggressive solvent.

CHARLES RIGGS: I think what you're saying, Alan, is that the ISO 3175 test methods have been don't cover the operating procedures. So that's where the issue is. The test method doesn't cover the operating procedure.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: I think it's going to be a little difficult to modify the test methods for any kind of trend that happens to be happening in the industry at that given time. So yes, there are machines out there that are heating solvent up. I don't think it's the majority of machines being sold, but they are out there. And I think it's not proven how aggressive it actually makes the solvent when you heat it up. There seems to be some measurable difference, but as far as I know, there's been no independent studies showing that heating hydrocarbon up raises its KP value from 25 to 75 or to a 93.

So yes, I agree with you, Alan, that the drying temperatures and the heating of the solvent all play an influence. I'm not exactly certain how we would write a standard to take into account. I believe that the ISO standard for solvents requires the temperature of the solvent to be within a certain range.

CHARLES RIGGS: It does.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: And so I guess we could mandate the same kind of standard if that doesn't currently

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: Exist-- Well, I'd like to see something where it says like a shortened cycle or reduced cycle or mild cycle to also include something as far as heating goes, whether you can or can't.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: I'd agree with that.

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: Industry, as far as what I'm seeing, we have a lot of multi colored garments, and the majority of the problems have to do with solvent temperature and drying temperatures. And it's just what I've been saying. Mary, do you see that with DNO?

MARY SCALCO: Mm-hmm.

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: Yeah. Six.

MARY SCALCO: But again, I think we need to address that at the ASTM/AATCC level and get the test method changed. I don't know that the change you're proposing-- I guess, here's what my point is. If what Alan brings up, and what we were just discussing, we go and have that changed at the ASTM and ISO level, and they change that standard, and they do that in 2013 so it reflects what happens in the industry, you're care labeling symbol requirement is now null and void. It's behind the times. See what I mean?

Unless you can react quicker than the industry can react-- I'm really having a problem with referring back to 2005 or 2002 or even today, 2012, standard. Why not refer to the most current standard of both of these? Because there are people around the room that sit on those committees that develop those standards based upon their level of expertise and what's happening in the industry. So then, your Federal Trade Commission rule is current with what's going on, and there's, I guess--

CHARLES RIGGS: So the answer to the question is that would remove the control out of the hands of FTC. If you had to just simply say FTC is going to take the most current standard, then FTC no longer controls the process.

MARY SCALCO: But if dry cleaning in itself changes--

CHARLES RIGGS: I agree with what you're saying.

MARY SCALCO: --and it refers back to a standard that is no longer typical of what's happening in the industry, or if it's a wet cleaning symbol, and it is no longer reflective of what the wet cleaning is that's happening in the industry, I don't see how that's beneficial to the consumer.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Moving back to what brought us to this discussion, is the change in the circle-P symbol in ASTM, and kind of give me the bottom line. What is the impact on this change-- what is the impact of this change on consumers, if any? Is there any reason why the FTC needs to address this specific change with any additional language in our proposed rule?

STACY SOPCICH: I think it would be a stretch to say consumers know what P means. I think the key is what does the professional cleaner think it means, and even there, honestly, our affiliates don't know what P means. Some think it means professional clean, P. Some think it means PERC. Some think it means no PERC.

They have no idea. Frequently, they do rely on the fiber label or the words to clarify their understanding, but in terms of the question, whether it's changed from its meaning, on the positive side, it's now harmonized with the ISO, and that's really critical. So I think the benefits outweigh the negatives, very much so.

CHARLES RIGGS: The logic discussed always at ISO and ASTM was the circle symbol should alert the consumer don't do this at home. Take it to the professional, and then the professional uses the right procedure based upon their training and knowledge and whatever else they see there. There's a modification in the test method for a mild cycle. I can't say it offhand what that means. I think it's a shorter cycle.

But the professional would know, or should have access to the training to know. Whether they avail themselves of the training or not, that's another issue, but I think the circle, to the consumer, should only mean don't do it at home. And then anything else we had is information for the professional.

AMANDA KOSTNER: All right, the next topic regards solvents and the absence of ASTM and ISO symbols for solvents other than PERC and petroleum. The Commission would be curious to know how this came about in the two different care labeling systems, if anyone has insight into that. Why are there only symbols for PERC and petroleum?

ADAM MANSELL: From the ISO point of view, there are symbols for those solvents that were prevalent on the market at the time. Whether it's any interest or not, ISO 3175, which Charles has referenced several times, which is the test method behind it, is being amended as we speak, and will almost certainly be broadened to include the new solvents that are on the market now.

STACY SOPCICH: And also relevant, is that the ASTM is now voting on a change to the definition of P and F, keeping the symbols but to change the definition to encompass alternate solvents as well. So I think the standards bodies are right where they need to be.

MARY SCALCO: For garment manufacturers, they have to have a basis to determine what they put on the label. If they're going to test, they need a test method, so the test methods all refer to a

specific solvent. They don't just say dry cleaning. They say dry cleaning in this solvent, you do this. Dry cleaning in this solvent, you do this.

If you don't have a test method, there's nothing for them to test to, so many times, you're developing the test method before you develop the symbol. So if they put that symbol, they have a basis for it. So that's why.

STACY SOPCICH: And we're also-- I mean, the AATCC is also going to be undertaking that necessary step to support the standard. If that passes, I mean, in order to have the science behind the standard.

CHARLES RIGGS: It was explained to me, I think. The history was the P actually stood for perchlorethylene or tetrachlorethylene, and that means that's the solvent you use, which as it turns out in the test method, is the most aggressive, and I think still the most aggressive. And if it withstands the most aggressive solvent, then it's safe for all others. The F, I was understood, was signifying flammable because these other solvent are some degree of flammable, and I think that's true even of the newer substitutes, that there's still flammable solvents.

Question would be could you use, I think it's part thee of 3175, to test the Green Earth solvent, or what do you have to modify? So I would think we probably could do with the two solvents, flammable and nonflammable, and if it's got a P, you can use anything. It's got an F, you can't use P, so that simplifies the process. Then the task for other solvents would be how do you modify 3175 for a test method for all of these different alternative solvents? And that's what's being worked on currently, and it would still probably carry the F symbol.

ADAM MANSELL: Probably.

ROBERT FRISBY: Can I just jump in for a second? I hear you all saying that the Commission should incorporate the most recent standard from both ASTM and ISO, notwithstanding the fact there's a difference on the drying symbols. Is that what I'm hearing?

CHARLES RIGGS: That's not what I would suggest. I would suggest you use the two that are harmonized.

ROBERT FRISBY: So you're saying we should use the 2005 ISO and the current ASTM?

CHARLES RIGGS: Yeah.

ROBERT FRISBY: And what about the rest of you?

ADAM MANSELL: I'd use the most current. I'd use 2012 because that's what the industry uses.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I think if we're not using the most current, there's not much point in even considering it. That's the whole point, is to be able to use the currency, so you can sell a product in multiple countries with the same label. And if you can't tell the product in Europe because you're using the 2005 standards, there's no point in using them in the US at all.

CHARLES RIGGS: Well, then you would say don't use the ASTM symbols because they would not be current with the current version of ISO, so all the manufactures would have to switch to ISO and drop ASTM.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: Not necessarily because they both have different benefits and different challenges. So if a company wants to use ASTM, they're allowed to have just the one symbol if they want to do that, and they can stay in the US market. If they want to use ISO, they can use the five symbols, but they have to use all five, which is a problem sometimes for US companies. They might have to pay the Genentech's fee for the licensing, so they may see more benefit in using the ASTM. I think it'll depend on the company's preferences.

ROBERT FRISBY: If there is a discrepancy in some of the symbols, does anyone have a suggestion as to how the Commission should address that in the rule, if at all? If it allows the two most recent standards?

ADAM MANSELL: It may be complicating the rule overly, but if you allow the use of ISO 3758 2012 excluding the natural drying symbols, then you wouldn't have a problem.

AMANDA KOSTNER: I wanted to turn back to some of the questions on solvents. We were talking about, right now, there are symbols for two different solvents, and I would like to know if the panelists have any evidence on what percentage of solvents dry cleaners are currently using. And do dry cleaners have multiple solvents in the same shop? Does anyone have any understanding of that, any data on that?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Yeah, so I think DLI and NCA probably have numbers to support this, but still, about 80% of the industry is using PERC as a solvent. The remaining is primarily a synthetic hydrocarbon with about 5% of the market being split up between the alternatives Green Earth, our solvent, propylene glycol, and then wet cleaning. So the dominant solvent is still PERC in the industry.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Might bring that PERC number down a little bit. I think it has dropped a little bit lower than that, and actually I believe your comment used 60%.

MARY SCALCO: Right, I think it's a little bit lower than that, but I do think that almost every shop has wet cleaning in it, professional wet cleaning in it. And I think nowadays, you might see more-- I don't know if it's a huge percentage that has multiple solvents in it, but some of the larger ones will have multiple solvents in there as well.

CHARLES RIGGS: Yeah, probably not more than two.

MARY SCALCO: Yeah.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Two plus water.

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: Two plus water, yeah.

MARY SCALCO: Two plus water.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Two plus water.

AMANDA KOSTNER: And, Stacy, did you want to add something?

STACY SOPCICH: I was going to say, our knowledge would say that it's gone down closer to 60 in terms of use of PERC. Even from a few years ago, it's dramatically declined. I think California's had a lot to do with that.

The larger cleaners are the anomaly in the industry. They're the ones that will have multiple processes for the most part. You've got one dry cleaning process and one wet cleaning process. Whether that's longer, you're a professional wet cleaning. That the reality of the industry.

AMANDA KOSTNER: OK, so we've heard testimony that both ISO and ASTM are looking at adding symbols for other solvents. I think that's what I heard. Is that correct?

ADAM MANSELL: Not symbols. Just test methods.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Test methods?

CHARLES RIGGS: And I don't see the symbols going beyond two, P and F.

STACY SOPCICH: What the ASTM is looking at doing in gen-- and also speak to this, is just keeping the symbols, but changing the definition. So with P, it would go back to what it was when there were three symbols, and there was an A for Any. When the solvents more aggressive than PERC left the market, they kind of collapsed the symbol system down to two, and so P then served the role of A. It still does, but they named PERC and petroleum because they were really, at the time, the only two viable commercially proven options. There are more now, so the definition of P would be any, which would get it back to, I think, a more useful definition.

AMANDA KOSTNER: So does the Commission need to do anything in addition to what ISO and ASTM are doing with alternative solvents? Is there any language or working that the Commission would need to consider in adding to the rule?

STACY SOPCICH: I see two things. One is I think it's worth discussing whether or not the Commission intentionally used the notion of in-use versus commercially available when it was naming its solvent examples because, for example, CO2 was named-- I don't know. Rich? Mary? How many CO2 cleaners are there left? I think--

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: It's about six.

STACY SOPCICH: Yeah, so--

MARY SCALCO: You're more generous than me. I'd have said two.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Well, if you include [INAUDIBLE], there's about six.

STACY SOPCICH: Yeah. And well, [INAUDIBLE], there were only about 13 machines ever made, and there might be-- you know, how many are left? But my point is when you say alternative solvents, I think there is a distinction that's worthy of discussion about whether or not they're commercially available versus in-use. Glycolate, there's another case in point.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: You're referring to the definition of dry cleaning, right?

STACY SOPCICH: Yes, going back to that. And then the-- wow, what was my other point?

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Are you saying we should be subtracting some of the ones with adding?

STACY SOPCICH: Well, I think there might have been an unintentional consequence of naming some of the solvents that were available but are already off the market. Solvents-- it takes time to withstand the test of time to prove operational viability, managing the cost and the labor. There's just a lot of factors besides the solvent itself, and so some of these come, and they go, and that's the nature of the marketplace. So at the moment, I mean--

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: I think the FTC has to be careful, though, not to use language that would prohibit innovation in the industry, and currently, it kind of does.

CHARLES RIGGS: I think the language choice is pretty clear. If you go through the FTC language, and you replace all those solvent examples and just say non-aqueous solvent, that would cover everything. So you're down to aqueous and non-aqueous.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: It's a non-exhaustive list. It's just examples.

CHARLES RIGGS: And then you don't restrict new innovations because they're clearly only non-aqueous. So I think that one word substituted everywhere you have those listed, just say non-aqueous solvent.

STACY SOPCICH: And they aren't just examples, so I think that's an issue. But the broader point that I was going to make is we just heard that both the standards bodies, ASTM and ISO, are looking to recognize alternative solvents in their sister of definitions and test methods. It seems prudent for the FTC to keep the rule making open long enough for those a lot of some of these processes to work their way. If you're going to point to a year-dated standard, and you promulgate the new rule and recognize non-organic solvents, for example, it won't do any good if the standards aren't also doing that. And so they need, I think, a little bit of time to allow that to catch up would be useful.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Anyone else on this issue? All right, I think we've heard a lot of evidence on my last topic. Consumer understanding of care labeling symbols. Is there anything that anyone would like to add new? I think we've heard a lot of evidence that consumers do not understand care symbols, but do we have anything else to add to this?

CHARLES RIGGS: In 1999, at the last round table, this was a topic, and we discussed various education methods. Clearly none of them worked. The one that I thought had the most promise, someone suggested that if you make this part of the kindergarten, first grade curriculum and send it home, then the kids could teach their parents, and it would grow by that. But that would take some FTC funding, I guess, to do that. But clearly, even my textual students, who clearly are the most interested consumers in textiles and apparel, are uninformed at the college level, so we've failed.

AMANDA KOSTNER: All right, we'll now open the floor up to Q&A. We've got a question in the front here. Rebecca? Paul would like to address the panel.

AUDIENCE: This is Paul Matthai, EPA. It is so much more fun to be on this side of the panel that it is over there. I just want to point that out. I'm going to throw something out that's really out there, just as a consideration in the future because every time something changes, you're going to have to go back and change a rule and change a rule, and it becomes catch up, and it's hard to do.

Suppose you would put a bar code on the label, and each dry cleaner, each cleaner, would have a bar code reading. You could update it anytime. They put it in there. It tells you how to wash the thing, and eventually that would get into the consumer area as well. Just go off the barcode under.

It says put this in this kind of wash. You just put in [INAUDIBLE], and you can always update without changing the regulations because you based it on standards. You just say whatever the current standards are. Just the thought. I'm sitting here, looking at all these things, all these symbols and stuff, and a barcode would just tell you right off.

CHARLES RIGGS: You're not out there, Paul. It's been done, but not in this market. In the industrial market, industry uniforms, bar codes are common. Of course, the barcodes don't always withstand the cleaning process, and RF chips seem to be the better option. And I know at least one cleaner in Dallas that actually sews in an RF chip in every customer's item, so when they bring it back, they know when they cleaned it back and how they cleaned it and what problems they encountered. So it's there.

AUDIENCE: And it just comes up, and you don't have to think. And that would help America.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: The use of the heat-sealed bar codes for tracking garments is prevalent in the industry. A lot of cleaners use that technology, and they've got pretty good at developing bar codes that will hold up fairly well. Your idea about actually using the barcode or a QR code or some kind of digital imprint to give the cleaner or the consumer-- the just take a picture of it, and all of a sudden, it pops up on their smartphone how do I process this textile. I guess that would require the manufacturers to have a database, and that would be tied back to that garment in some way.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

AMANDA KOSTNER: I think we're going to move on to our next question from the audience. Rebecca, you have someone back there?

AUDIENCE: Hi, I'm Carl. I'm a garment care professional. And as I understand the discussion about the symbols, if the P represents all solvents and the W represents non-aqueous solvents, then wouldn't requiring the two symbols on there cover your entire basis of professional cleaning? Thus there would not be any discrepancy in the process and deception to the consumer.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Panelists?

STACY SOPCICH: It seems like we're going back to writing the law. I mean, the law currently says one method, so--

AUDIENCE: Well, the P would represent one method, but if you had both, you wouldn't have any-- you would cover all your bases if you had the two symbols because you would cover both chemical solvents and water, if you had both symbols on there. In other words, [INAUDIBLE] with P would [INAUDIBLE].

ROBERT FRISBY: Well, the discrepancy we talked about earlier had to do with the home washing issue, not the professional care issue. I think that's right. Natural drying, the drying is not a professional care issue.

CHARLES RIGGS: If you were to require all five symbols, then you could do what you described, and I think it would be fair to all markets. But what was suggested earlier, which I object to, was requiring only one. I think you either require all five, or you leave it like it is, require them to put in a method.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Next question from the back, please?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]. When they do catch up with the ever-changing safety requirements, what Consumer Product--

AMANDA KOSTNER: Can you speak up, please?

AUDIENCE: To catch up with the changing safety requirements, what Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, for toys and some of the product is what they have in the rule is they have a set standard that they've agreed upon, and then what they've done is they say any time ASTM publishes new standard, they'll evaluate it. They have 90 days, and then if the Commission disagrees with the changes, they keep the old standard. If they agree with the changes, we work with the new standard. It becomes effective 90 or whatever days we decide upon. So something like that might be helpful if you put it in the rule, can give you the flexibility to evaluate the changes.

AMANDA KOSTNER: And that is something-- I'm not sure what our ability is. We would have to look into that. Front row here please?

AUDIENCE: Yes, the ques-- I mean, if we go back to where we had the recommendation is that consumers can be educated from in the kindergarten level, so that means it's not going to happen. And all that I'm hearing is that you're trying to not educate the other side of the game, which is the professionals. So care label will educate the professionals by telling them what symbols and what not, and the biggest distinction that I'm seeing is that we're almost saying that ASTM is no good. Go with the ISO, and if ISO is the one thing that we need to learn, and if we're vying to get the ISO to educate the professionals, might as well just educated the professionals, but through their own guidelines. And then leave the ASTM as is.

All the other ways that if ASTM is all that not good and updated, just take the ISO and get rid of the ASTM because if ASTM hasn't learned enough, then just let's go with the ISO. And why have this dilemma of educating one side or the other side because consumers is definitely not the one to be educated. You cannot.

So in this case, you're educating only the professionals. Stay with the professional. Just go with the one symbol. Don't make this complicated for both sides and putting ISO and ASTM and all those things are not needed. And you wouldn't be able to probably keep track of these changes going on because it's going to go on and on and on.

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I'll say I hope that I didn't come across saying the ASTM was no good because I don't believe that. I do think that ASTM symbols have their own merit. There are certainly reasons why companies are interested in using the ISO symbols because ASTM is not allowed in Europe, but in other places. But it doesn't necessarily inherently mean the ASTM isn't a good thing already. It just is different, and we need to figure out a way to make it easier for companies to be able to use both or to be able to just make some kind of common ruling for it.

ADAM MANSELL: Like they also wouldn't defend ISO in terms of its education, because the lack of education that there may be for ASTM from both consumers and professionals is exactly the same for the ISO symbols.

AMANDA KOSTNER: We've got a question in the back corner here.

AUDIENCE: I'm Lou Protonentis with AATCC. We've gone over and discussed ASTM versus ISO symbols and changing them, adding five of them versus two and crossing them out, and we just came back to our central point a little while ago about the final point of this. Both y'all from the FTC have been good about pointing us back, focusing us on the final aspect of this is protection of the consumer.

But we just talked about education and kind of just threw it out the window. How can we do any of this, whatever decision that comes out of this? The final point should be the education of it, so whatever law we change, whatever symbols we choose, I don't see how we can eliminate some form of education, whether it starts at kindergarten or there starts at college students. But there has to be some form of education. Otherwise, everything we do, we might as well go to the definition of insanity.

AMANDA KOSTNER: And the Commission-- I mean, we would be interested in learning how to better educate consumers. When the rule was revised the last time, education-- we did attempt to educate consumers, and now we're hearing from various people that it hasn't worked. So are there other suggestions beyond starting in kindergarten? What can we do?

ADAM MANSELL: There's only one part of this industry that has the reach and the resources to do that, and they're called retailers.

AUDIENCE: We're talking. We have the retailers now. We have a greater vested interest in it.

We've got a panel here that are working out with the dry cleaners and the wet cleaners. We have a larger group of people that's willing to help. So somebody goes to a store, they have a captive audience being able to educate. So every time they go in, they learn something.

Next time they come in, they're better educated. They make a more educated decision for that purchase, then they make a better educated decision for the other purchases. And then they start telling their friends. There's various aspects of it. There's various [INAUDIBLE] educated. I just don't want us to throw the baby out with the bath water.

Even if we haven't done it before, we can't do it again and again. There other options. There's other parameters. There's other people that can do it. I just want us to keep focusing on [INAUDIBLE].

CHARLES RIGGS: The things that have worked-- the retail packaging has certainly helped a lot. I think some of the external packaging has a lot of information from some manufacturers about the symbols and what they mean, and I think most machine manufacturers for homeowner machines now have the symbols in the door, tell you what to do with them. And they may have dots on the dial instead of hot, warm, and cold, so you know that they're picking up parts of it. But in general, it's very frustrating to be stopped somewhere on the street, or in my case in a classroom, how poorly informed they are.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: I think companies like Procter and Gamble, too, could play a big part in educating consumers. Manufacturers of household cleaning products that are used for the care of textiles obviously have a big vested interests that the consumer knows how to use their products. While education is a great topic to focus on, I don't see huge crowds of people walking down the street with ruined garments. People seem to be managing with their limited knowledge of the symbols as they are right now. I think it's important to provide as much education, but I think we're not idiots. We seem to be able to wash most of our clothes and get the rest dry cleaned adequately.

CHARLES RIGGS: The usually don't wear their ruined ones.

RICHARD FITZPATRICK: Well, yeah.

ALAN SPIELVOGEL: You might want to put some type of tag on the garment with a link to the FTC site that explains the whole thing if anybody, consumers interested.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Yeah. All right, I'll take another question from the audience, please.

AUDIENCE: I represent a manufacturer, and I wanted to address a-- I have a question. There was something that you had said. The proposal said that if we use the ASTM symbols, we don't need to identify them, and if we use the ISO, we do need to identify them. So my question to you is what is the FTC's objective to offering to use both sets of symbols on the label? What started that off? And then I have a suggestion.

AMANDA KOSTNER: I'm going to defer to Robert on this one.

ROBERT FRISBY: In reviewing the rule making record, the comments we received earlier in the process, a number of the commenters urged the Commission to try to have greater harmonization internationally to facilitate trade in textiles. And so a number of the commenters urged the Commission to go with ISO, and there were some that urged the Commission to allow the use of both systems. And that's what the Commission ultimately decided to propose, was the use of both systems, but there was a concern about the fact that consumers, at least in theory, had more experience with ASTM symbols given that they were permissible over 10 years ago. And I think that led the Commission to propose this additional disclosure requirement for ISO, but we want to know. And it sounds like there's not a lot of support for that in the comments we received more recently, and so we want to get the views of people here about whether that's worth doing or unnecessary or what have you.

AUDIENCE: So here's my suggestion. So like I said, I work for a major manufacturer. I've worked for them for 22 years, and I think they were in existence about 30 years. They've never used ASTM symbols ever because the consumer doesn't understand them. But under the FTC regulations, we're allowed to either put it in the English language, in words, or use the symbols, so we opt to put it in English for the American consumer.

We recently went into Europe, and I'm right in with Genentech and ISO, and I know them inside out at this point. And we got tired making labels for the same style that's going to the US, and then a different label for the same style going to Europe, so we decided to invent what we're calling our global label. And we are currently putting ISO symbols on it with the English language to satisfy the US and to satisfy the European.

So to answer the question about whether we need to identify if we're allowed to use both sets of symbols, do we need to identify them? No, we don't need to identify them. As Americans for the American market, we have the option to use ASTM symbols or English words, and I guarantee you, I do a lot of benchmarking, and not many US manufacturers are using ASTM symbols. So I don't think you need to identify them.

ROBERT FRISBY: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you last point.

AUDIENCE: I don't think you need to identify which symbols you're using.

ROBERT FRISBY: I hear you. OK.

AMANDA KOSTNER: So I have seven more minutes. How many questions are there in the room? All right, I see two hands.

AUDIENCE: Hi, I'm Jennifer Morgan, and I work for one of those big retailers, JC Penney. And we've tried various things over the years to try and educate our customers about care. We don't sell outside the United States, so we're limited to what we do here. We did try one brand specifically on our Intimates to just use the symbols, and our customers complained so much about it. They had no idea.

So when you talk about education, I think one of the things you need to look at is utilizing social media. As a retailer, every penny is huge, and putting a hang tag, putting a bigger label, putting everything, costs us, our customers, and our manufacturers a lot of money. But what we're finding now, and we do a lot with the CPSC, is if we utilize our social media, our Facebook and that, we have a huge number of our customers that see that, and I think that would be a great way, going forward, to educate. It's the way of the future, is utilize the social media.

AMANDA KOSTNER: I saw another question over here.

AUDIENCE: Hi, I'm Peggy Gordon Armstrong from LL Bean, and I'm in support of the FTC allowing the ISO symbols to make it easier for us to sell in the US and also have the symbols for other countries that would accept those symbols. But if you were to allow either ASTM or ISO, then the FTC guidance on the maximum number of symbols allowed would be helpful just as a guidance document, is what my suggestion would be.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Does anyone who sells overseas have an issue with too many symbols on their garments?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

AMANDA KOSTNER: I don't know. For a consumer.

AUDIENCE: ISO you have [INAUDIBLE].

STACY SOPCICH: I guess a question I would have is my understanding was that the Commission was looking at adopting the symbols, but not the system or the standard. There's a big difference, in my mind, between those two, and I feel like we're talking on both sides of it. Are we talking about adapting the standard or the symbol?

ROBERT FRISBY: It's the symbols, but they have to be used in compliance with the rule. So reasonable basis would still be required for a Do Not, Do Not whatever, or a maximum.

STACY SOPCICH: It's a very simple proposition, really.

ADAM MANSELL: You're adopting the graphics, not the standard .

ROBERT FRISBY: That's right.

AMANDA KOSTNER: Any other questions?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

ROBERT FRISBY: No, the rule permits the use of ASTM symbols in lieu of written instructions, but it doesn't prohibit extra information.

AUDIENCE: OK, so I have written instructions in English, and I have [INAUDIBLE].

ROBERT FRISBY: That would not violate the rule, as long as you have a reasonable basis for all the instructions.

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE].

AUDIENCE: So this question for the panel. I'm [INAUDIBLE]. I think the question was whether to adopt the latest standards versus to a specific standard because FTC wants to have jurisdiction over the standards. I think the latest standards, whatever is the latest standards, because the technology is changing, so the ASTM and the AATCC are the two organized governing bodies here, which make the standards which the industry in general, whether it's a testing lab or a regular [INAUDIBLE], they keep on changing the standards because the technology's changing. So if we just stick ourselves to an old standard, the problem is we're going back to the same problem, which we have right now, where we are still using 96C symbols as opposed to in the year 2014, so that's one of the aspects of it.

The other aspect is the care labeling instructions just provide us about the care labeling rule just provides us about the rule. It doesn't say when we can accept or reject the product. For accepting or rejecting the product, we still rely on the standards set up by the governing bodies like the AATCC or the ASTM. So if it's a grade three and banned from a testing lab, for example, I would refer back to the AATCC test [INAUDIBLE] grade three or grade 3.5, whichever I have based on the industry practice [INAUDIBLE] reject the product for care labeling requirement based on those standards, and if those standards change, we'll automatically change our way of testing, too, in the way they change. So if we keep ourselves confined to a 2005 standard for our ISO or 96C for an ASTM, we are basically reverting back to our outdated style of working in this age.

And the third aspect is we can also look at the FTC textile labeling rules, which really doesn't say refer to any ASTM or AATCC standards. It gives us the regulations. It also tells us to accept ISO generic names for certain fibers, and it doesn't really tell us whether you should test to ASTM or ISO standards. By default, we all go to test to ASTM for the AATCC standards, and as they keep on changing, they keep on adding new fibers in the industry.

AATCC also makes the changes how to identify those fibers. We use that test method, so by default, maybe AATCC can think of that this is the standard and that this is the rule. And in case of any dispute or questions, you refer back to American standard body ASTM or AATCC because the reasonable basis requirement is only for FTC.

Europe, care instructions is voluntary. Canada, care instructions is voluntary. So the reasonable basis requirement, it's a regulatory requirement in the US, so we would have to think of that, whether it makes more sense to adopt to the latest standards and not just refer to a particular year to that standard.

AMANDA KOSTNER: I think we have one minute. Does anyone have anything to say?

MARIE D'AVIGNON: I'll just add real quickly, as you mentioned the new changes to the fiber rules say that you can now use the updated ISO generic names. If someone puts on their label a Elastane instead of Spandex, which is the ISO name, you don't have to say this is the ISO name Elastane. You just say Elastane, and you expect that people in the United States either will understand it or not really care enough to have to specify that it's the ISO name and not the name by ASTM. So why would we necessarily need to express it this way for care symbols if we don't care about the generic names?

ROBERT FRISBY: It sounds like no one is in favor of that proposal.

AMANDA KOSTNER: All right. Well, thank you. We have a 15 minute break. We will be starting at 2:30 for our final panel. Thank you.