2016 - 052 G Plan

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): G Plan Upholstery Ltd
Address: Hampton Park West, Melksham, Wiltshire SN12 6GU

	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: Definition of mattress protector that 'can be washed' is open to wide interpretation.

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 welcome a better definition of scatter cushions. However, while the regulation excludes cover tests on these items, there still seems to be a grey area concerning instances where scatters are 'supplied with' an upholstered item. In this instance is seems there is a belief that scatters should then comply with the cover tests. Interpretation of 'supplied with' is very wide. Could the regulations tighten this by adding to the scatter cushion definition, so it is clear that unless the scatter is integral to the upholstered item i.e. the upholstered item does not fulfil it's original design without it/them, that they are excluded from cover tests.

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: If for second hand product which is unchanged since manufacture – yes. But if item is re-upholstered would need new permanent label to reflect relevant change and traceability

Questions on testing

Q7 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Simplifies procedure

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: More relevant for test houses to comment on this.

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

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

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Believe the 2mm hole will be very difficult to measure. This may alos lead to increased use of back coating. Would support current match test requirements over FR foam, which may also reduce back coating.

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

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: This will very difficult to carry out on small components and add cost without delivering significant safety benefit, as small components will have little impact on overall flammability of item. This will also lead to increased use of fire retardants

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: In our experience a very small number of top covers (less than 1%) fail the cigarette test while passing the match test.

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: Do not believe all covers will be protective under new match test holing requirement. This would be chosen route if achievable due to cost, but could result in more back coating. The interliner seems the most straightforward approach but do not yet know if the cost of this would outweigh cost of sourcing compliant components as they are currently not widely available. No experience of using interliners – may compromise design.

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: Preferred compliance route would be protective cover

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: Not all covers are likely to be protective, so would need FR added to components or to interline.

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: May be issue for smaller operators

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: Think this is very positive change to the regulations

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: Text – easier to accommodate changes.

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: A longer transition period would allow better investigation and development of options throughout the supply chain, which may lead to more robust solutions using less FRs

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: It is not clear if private rental properties (both residential and holiday) are covered by these Regulations. Cannot understand why the test methods still reference old test standards and modify them. It would be clearer if the complete test method was included in the regulations. The cigarette test for relevant materials is still a composite test – this is not workable in practice is not the route to compliance currently used, where the fabrics are used with a 'worstcase' filling and then sold to be suitable with any filling. Part 4, clause 12 para (1) refers to paras (2) to (4) – this is no para (4)

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: Believe this will be far more than this. This is more likely time for each new model.

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

Amount saved: Difficult to answer this as do not know how test labs will reduce testing cost – still have to do conditioning etc. of sample. Any savings will be outweighed by extra match testing and 5 x testing on components.

☒ Nothing ☐ Not sure

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

Amount saved: believe this will increase FR use

☒ 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: Click here to enter text.

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