2016 -075 London Fire Brigade.

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): London Fire Brigade
Address: 169 Union Street, London SE1 0LL

	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: LFB believe that the definitions are clear and unambiguous

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: LFB understand the rationale for these to be excluded because in the course of the products lifetime any flame retardant chemicals are soon washed off.

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: LFB are satisfied because the filling will still have to satisfy the relevant ignition test in previous regulations

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: LFB agree with the definition and the fact that they will be clearly marked non compliant.

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: LFB agree that the rationale is sound (e.g. low fuel load and predominant use is outside the home) and they will be subject to other British Standards

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: LFB strongly believe this should be mandatory because it is more likely the most vulnerable who will have second hand furniture.

Questions on testing

Q7 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: LFB understand the business case for this

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: LFB are satisfied there is no reduction in safety.

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: LFB are satisfied there is no reduction in safety

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: LFB are satisfied there is no reduction in safety

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

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: LFB are satisfied there is no reduction in safety

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: Although LFB are happy with the proposal we wish to bring the following to your attention. The match test is concerned with speed of ignitability and exposure to a high heat source. Smouldering, as in the cigarette test, is based on long exposure to a low heat source. These behave very differently, and therefore it doesn't always follow that covers which pass the match test will automatically pass the cigarette test. However, it was agreed that the less than 1 per cent failure rate figure for the cigarette test on visible covers was accurate. And it was suggested that the cigarette test for non- visible covers is entirely redundant as there were no known failures. It was pointed out that this assumes that the types of covers by manufacturers will not change with the new regulations. Different covers might become more popular which could mean that the currently low failure rate for the cigarette test could increase. Removal of the cigarette test would reduce testing costs to industry. Carrying out a match test costs about two-thirds of the cost of combined match and cigarette testing. A new standard for a smoulder and ignition test could be developed using something other than a cigarette, for example, an electronic substitute such as cartridge heaters. Or something specific to industry could be developed but this would take time and money so might be something to be considered in the longer term.

For business respondents: N/A FOR LFB

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: LFB understand the business case for this

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: LFB understand the business case for this

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: LFB believe that both text and symbols should be used to ensure as many persons understand the meaning and gravitas of the label.

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: LFB consider that it is essential to: review future developments of cover fabrics and their ignitability performance, or special review in case of identifiable adverse trends; to give reassurance that domestic users are not exposed to increased danger

Questions on the Impact Assessment N/A FOR LFB

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: 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: 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