2016 - 042 Fedustria

Department for
Business, Energy
& Industrial Strategy

Consultation on updating the Furniture and Furnishings (Fire) (Safety) Regulations (FFRs) response form

The consultation is available at: www.gov.uk/government/consultations/furniture-and-furnishing-fire-safety-regulations-proposed-changes-2016

The closing date for responses is **11 November 2016**.

The form can be submitted by email to: furniture.consultation2016@bis.gsi.gov.uk or submitted by letter to:

Christine Knox
Regulatory Delivery
Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Second Floor
1 Victoria Street
London
SW1H 0ET

Please be aware that we intend to publish all responses to this consultation.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or release to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. Please see the section on confidentiality and data protection on page 7 of the consultation for further information.

If you want information, including personal data, that you provide to be treated in confidence, please explain to us what information you would like to be treated as confidential and why you regard the information as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the department.

I want my response to be treated as confidential ☐

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Questions

Name: [redacted]
Organisation (if applicable): **Fedustria vzw** (= Federation of the Belgian textile manufacturers, amongst them are **35 manufacturers of upholstery fabrics, all exporters to the UK**)
Address: Hof-ter-Vleestdreef 5/1 in B 1070 Brussels and Poortakker 96-98 in B 9051 Gent (Belgium)

	Respondent type
☒	**Business representative organisation/trade body**
☐	Central government
☐	Charity or social enterprise
☐	Individual
☐	Test House
☐	Manufacturer
☐	Retailer
☐	Large business (over 250 staff)
☐	Legal representative
☐	Local government
☐	Medium business (50 to 250 staff)
☐	Micro business (up to 9 staff)
☐	Small business (10 to 49 staff)
☒	**Trade union or staff association**
☐	Other (please describe)

Questions on scope

Q1 Do you agree with the revised definition of the Regulation's scope?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q2 Do you agree with the proposals relating to sleeping bags and mattress protectors (i.e. those which can be put in a washing machine are explicitly removed from scope and do not have to meet the requirements of the regulations)?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q3 Do you agree with the proposals relating to cushions and seat pads (i.e. that they remain excluded from cover tests but the definition of these products to be specified more clearly)?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not sure

Comments: **We should suggest to use for both scatter cushions and seat pads the same dimensions. Moreover we feel that 70cm x 70cm should be more appropriate**.

Q4 Do you agree with the proposals relating to outdoor furniture (i.e. that outdoor furniture unsuitable for use inside the home, and clearly labelled as not complying with the Regulations) should be out of scope?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q5 Do you agree with the proposals relating to baby products (i.e. that items covered by covered by BS EN1888 (wheeled child conveyances) and BS EN1466 (carry cots and stands) are removed from scope, with padded playpens treated in the same way as mattresses)?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q6 Do you agree with the proposed treatment of second-hand products (i.e. that they would be required to bear the relevant permanent label)?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Questions on testing

Q7 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q8 Do you agree that the specifications set out in the draft Regulations for the test foam and fibre wrap are sufficient to achieve the objectives of the Regulations?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: **We believe the composition and certainly the density of the fibre wrap have to be specified**

Q9a Do you agree that the regulations should provide a protective cover option?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q9b If yes, do you agree with our proposed definition of protectiveness?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: **It may be expected that the "2mm diameter hole" approach will cause a lot of different interpretations between the different test houses. Moreover, as the test has to be done 5 times (with 4 pass), this will be quite expensive!**

Q10 Do you agree with the proposed requirements for components close to the cover?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: **We believe 90% of the fabrics will be "non-protective". Consequently all other components (even small ones with low fire risk) will have to be tested. This will cause a lot of extra testing and additional costs without any relevant increase of the safety level. Moreover it would be useful to clearly define what has to be considered as "inside" components (is a component which is visible from the outside also included?)**

Q11 Do you agree that there is no need for the cigarette test for covers that pass the revised match test?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

For business respondents:

Q12 Which of the routes to compliance do you expect to follow for most of your products?

☐ Schedule 3 interliner ☐ Protective cover

☒ Non-protective cover + compliant components ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q13a What do you expect the impact of the testing proposals to be on your use of flame retardants in covers?

☒ Increase ☐ Decrease ☐ No change ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q13b What do you expect the impact of the testing proposals to be on your overall use of flame retardants?

☒ Increase ☐ Decrease ☐ No change ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Questions on traceability and enforcement

Q14 Do you agree with the product record/technical file requirements for manufacturers and importers?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q15a Do you agree with the requirements for the single permanent label, and the proposal to remove the requirement for additional display labels?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q15b What do you think is the most effective means of conveying the use of flame retardants in the cover of this product eg by text, symbol?

Comments: **logo or symbol. However, why only the fire retardants in the cover and why not also those used in the interliners, fillings, etc..**

Other questions on the proposals

Q16 Do you agree that a 24 month transition period is sufficient, and that the changes should be reviewed in five years?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not sure

Comments: **Some of our customers have models which stay longer on the market. 36 months should be more appropriate.**

Q17 Do you have any other comments on the proposals or draft regulations?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: **1. The cigarette test for the so-called "relevant materials" must be updated since the cigarette test in the regulations is no longer available. 2. We are strongly opposed to the "2 mm hole criterion" (will be source of endless discussions between test houses) and suggest to change this pass/fail criterion in self-extinguishing.**

Questions on the Impact Assessment

Q18 Do you agree with our estimate of traceability time in the Impact Assessment – ie one-off input of 16 hours per firm and ongoing per year time of 48 hours per firm? If not can you provide additional evidence to support your answer?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: **No doubt this will be much more.**

Q19 How much do you estimate you would save per year from the removal of the cigarette test?

Amount saved: Click here to enter text.

☐ Nothing ☒ Not sure

Q20 How much do you estimate you would save per year from reduced use of flame retardants?

Amount saved: Click here to enter text.

☒ Nothing ☐ Not sure

Q21 Are you aware of any further costs or benefits we have not identified in the impact assessment? Please support with any evidence you have.

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: **We are afraid that all discussions about the 2mm hole criterion will create much more tests. Moreover if we would like to get for our fabrics the status of "protective cover" we will have to test 5 times (= more tests; so more costs) and we will probably need more flame retardants.**

Q22 To what extent do you agree that, overall, these proposals represent a reasonable compromise – bearing in mind the information in this consultation document, feedback on the previous (2014) consultation, and other stakeholder input during the review?

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☒ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply ☒

At BEIS we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be okay if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

☒Yes ☐No

BEIS/16/11/RF