2016-081

Redacted

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:

Questions

Name:
Organisation (if applicable): Mothercare UK Ltd
Address: Cherry Tree Road, Watford, Hertfordshire WD24 6SH. UK

	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?

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

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)?

☐ 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)?

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Further clarity may be necessary on whether additional seat pads to be used in children's highchairs or seats are considered to be the same as "seat pads" and therefore now excluded from cover tests. Currently "upholstered liners" for children's items fall within the requirements of the existing Regulations when sold with the product itself.

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?

☐ 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)?

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: It is appreciated that not all products can be listed in the definition however further clarity may be required for items that are similar in appearance and construction to those listed in Definition (2) (b) "children's furniture, cots, playpens, high-chairs" such as travel cots, cribs etc. In addition and in relation to those items excluded in Definition (3) (c), further clarity is required on whether moses baskets are excluded as these products are more likely to be used within the home than externally.

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)?

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Questions on testing

Q7 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option?

☐ 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?

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

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

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

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

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

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

☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

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

☐ 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: This will be largely dependant on the design of the furniture itself

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: For a number of travel items such as pushchairs, strollers, travel systems and car seats, the use of FR treatments such as plasticised back coatings will decrease significantly due to their exclusion. For the other items subject to the Regulations, it may either remain the same or increase slightly dependant on whether the cover is intended to be protective.

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: Given that symbols are widely used and do not require translation it may be time to use a symbol or pictogram to show the measures taken. This could be a good opportunity to give clarity.

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: Click here to enter text.

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

☐ Yes No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Click here to enter text.

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:

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: Approximate saving could be between £485,000 - £1,200,000 on wheeled goods and infant carrier car seats, dependant on construction and materials used.

☐ 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: When considering global opportunities, the proposed amendments could lead to reduction in costs associated with the dual- manufacturing of products, associated administration and stock holding

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

Comments: We consider that the proposals, including the new definitions and scope of the Regulations to provide a workable compromise, although further clarification as raised is requested.

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