2016 051

Response ID ANON-F7WP-29R2-K

Submitted to **Furniture and furnishings fire safety regulations: proposed changes (2016)**
Submitted on **2016-10-25 09:56:45**

Introduction

1 What is your name?

Name:
[redacted]

2 What is your email address?

Email:
[redacted]

Yes

3 What is your organisation?

Organisation:
Furniture maker

4 How would you classify your organisation?

Organisation type:
Manufacturer

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:

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:

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)?

Not sure

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)?

Not sure

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:

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?

Yes

Comment box:

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

Yes

Comment box:

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?

Not sure

Comment box:

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

Yes

Comment box:

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

Non-protective cover + compliant components

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?

No change

Comment box:

Traceability and enforcement

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

Not sure

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:

Other questions

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

Not sure

Comment box:

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

Comment box:
You choose the wrong way to achieve fire retardancy and minimizing the use of flame retardants. You maybe reduce the use of FR with 0-10% with the new modified test for the covers but still 90% of FR are use in the Crib5 PUR Foams without purpose.
The way you should go is to minimise or cut the FR use in the Foams and make the covers or interliner as a fire barrier.
This action could reduce the use of flame retardants in 90-100% in the furniture.

Is the cover that catch fire first. If the cover is fire safe then whole component is fire safe.
If the cover is catching fire then is no matter if we use Crib 5 foam or not. It's burns anyway. It's just matter of time and ignition source.

Hope you consider that and change your minds. Manufacturers cannot use so match Toxic FR that makes people sick and poison the environment.
You can do something with that. Have a good luck!

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::

Not sure

Comment box:
It depends on how many test we have to do by the external laboratory.
I am not sure that with new regulations it will be more testing or less.
What is the answer?

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

Amount saved::
Nothing

Nothing

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.

Yes

Comment box:
New regulations means ours and days with reading and learning this documents.
Please make it easier for the users.

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?

Disagree

Comment box: