2016 - 057

Response ID ANON-F7WP-2919-S

Submitted to **Furniture and furnishings fire safety regulations: proposed changes (2016)**
Submitted on **2016-09-19 09:19:28**

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name:
[redacted]

2 What is your email address?

Email:
[redacted]

Yes

3 What is your organisation?

Organisation:
HALO Creative & Design ltd

4 How would you classify your organisation?

Organisation type:
Business representative organisation/trade body

Other - please describe here:

Scope

5 The proposed regulations cover any item of domestic furniture which is ordinarily intended for private use in a dwelling and comprises a cover fabric and a filling.Do you agree with the revised definition of the Regulation's scope?

Yes

Comment box:
any public use furniture was in the list of exclustion? Such as the dining chair used in the resrantant.....?

6 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

Comment box:
shall give some more accurate defination about the sleeping bags and mattress protectors.

7 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

Comment box:

8 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

Comment box:

9 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

Comment box:

10 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

Comment box:

Testing

11 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option? (i.e. to remove the option to test where covers are placed directly over the foam filling in the final product)

Yes

Comment box:
it is easy to done, and no nee to use specified foam.

12 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?

No

Comment box:

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

No

Comment box:
it is not easy to operatation

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

Not sure

Comment box:

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

No

Comment box:
if the cushion material is feather & down, we also pack the feather & down with the down-proof fabric. if this fabric want to pass the Fire test, its down-proof performance will no so good.

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

No

Comment box:
according to our test data, not all the material can pass the cigarette test if it pass the match test. for the cover material which compostion is over 75% percent natual material, it can pass the match test but FAIL to the cigaretee test.
it is sueded in the face surface.

17 For business respondents - Which of the routes to compliance do you expect to follow for most of your products?

Schedule 3 interliner

Comment box:

18 For business respondents - What do you expect the impact of the testing proposals to be on your use of flame retardants in covers?

No change

Comment box:

19 For business respondents - What do you expect the impact of the testing proposals to be on your overall use of flame retardants?

Decrease

Comment box:

Traceability and enforcement

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

Yes

Comment box:

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

Yes

Comment box:

22 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?

Comment box:
mark in the permanent label as US

Other questions

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

Yes

Comment box:

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

Comment box:
Change the test cigarette, most of the cigarette has filter instead of non-filter.
also the test cigarette can be brought in the supermarket easily.

Impact Assessment

25 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?

Not sure

Comment box:

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

Amount saved::
10K USD

Not sure

Comment box:

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

Amount saved::
20K USD

Not sure

Comment box:

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

Not sure

Comment box:

29 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?

Agree

Comment box: