2016 - 124

Response ID ANON-F7WP-29RN-F

Submitted to **Furniture and furnishings fire safety regulations: proposed changes (2016)**
Submitted on **2016-11-03 14:27:40**

Introduction

Redacted

1 What is your name?

Name:

2 What is your email address?

Email:

Yes

3 What is your organisation?

Organisation:
Wood Panel Industries Federation

4 How would you classify your organisation?

Organisation type:
Business representative organisation/trade body

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?

Not Answered

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)?

Not Answered

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)?

Not Answered

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?

Not Answered

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 Answered

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 Answered

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)

Not Answered

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?

Not Answered

Comment box:

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

Not Answered

Comment box:

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

Not Answered

Comment box:

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

No

Comment box:
Furniture design and the use of various materials will change with fashion and technology but certain materials such as wood and wood based panels will always be used to some extent. The removal of the proposed exclusion list creates a problem whereby each furniture manufacturer may need to test the same material (e.g. 10mm chipboard), for the same result, leading to unnecessary costs to the furniture manufacturers or the need to add a protective cover where it might not be necessary. Wood based panels (within certain parameters and without coating) were to be on the proposed 2014 exclusion list and we believe that they should remain excluded, generically in some way, to reduce the potential testing burden to the furniture industry, especially as the test data already exists.

potential solutions could be;

1.exemption list as previously proposed,

2. shared data or pooled data for common materials

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

Not Answered

Comment box:

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

Not Answered

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?

Not Answered

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?

Not Answered

Comment box:

Traceability and enforcement

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

Not Answered

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?

Not Answered

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 Answered

Comment box:

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

Comment box:

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 Answered

Comment box:

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

Amount saved::

Not Answered

Comment box:

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

Amount saved::

Not Answered

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.

Not Answered

Comment box:

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?

Not Answered