2016-024 - Chief Fire Officers Association.

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): Chief Fire Officers Association
Address: 9-11 Pebble Close, Amington, Tamworth, Staffordshire. B77 4RD.

	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 (CFOA, as an association, is the collective profession voice of the UK Fire and Rescue Service

Questions on scope

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Information relating to furniture and furnishings within the non domestic environment would be helpful and reference to any additional guidance which may be relevant in these circumstances

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: Whilst the general consensus were largely in agreement to remove these from the scope, cognisance should be taken of the potential for such items to come into contact with charging devices and , as such, would still benefit from the correct warning information and labelling.

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: Question 2 response provides a similar response to this question.

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: These items should continue to be suitably marked as for outside use only and clearly labelled as to the dangers of these items being used within a dwelling.

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: There are indeed other standards relating to these products , however, cognisance should be taken to ensure the fire resistance of upholstery is addressed prior to the removal from the regulations.

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: The proposal to use combustion modified foam (CMF) removes the worst case scenario of using non-CMF that provided reassurance with the previous test. There are a number of different grades of CMF on the market and its performance in fire can be affected by a number of factors. CFOA, through consultee responses, believes a chemical and physical specification for CMF tests is required. Currently there is no consistent standard for such foam products . We would urge BEIS to action this and provide credible, published evidence that fire safety is not compromised before making any changes to the Regulations. CFOA understands that BEIS accepted the proposal made previously for this matter to be considered by a BSI committee. CFOA's preferred approach is to ask the relevant BSI committee to give the expert and independent assurance that BEIS and their advisors should expect when considering change to important fire safety issues. CFOA urges BEIS

to action this recommendation and would support BEIS in working with manufacturers to specify fibre density for fibre wrap.

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Clarification on the distinction between this and cushions/seat pads pads would be welcome

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not sure

Comments: Clarity around hole size and formation as this part remains unclear in relation to adequacy and regularity.

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

☒ Yes ☐ 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?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: There appears not enough evidence that ALL materials would pass this test and, in the presence of that doubt then CFOA would not support removing this test with its knowledge of smoking being a key contributory factor in fires.

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: Both text and symbol should be included along with any related warnings around laundering

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: Click here to enter text.

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

Amount saved: N/A

☒ 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: 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