2016 - 099

Redacted

Annex 4: Consultation 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.

Please follow the instructions on Section 2 on how to return a completed form.

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 for further information.

If you want information, including personal data, that you provide to be treated as confidential, please explain to us below why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we shall 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:

Name:
Organisation (if applicable): SAINSBURY'S SUPERMARKETS LTD
Address: DRAKEN DRIVE, ALSTON PARK, COVENTRY. CV4 9RD

	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:

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:

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: DIMENSIONS FOR SEAT PAD SEEM TOO SMALL, ESPECIALLY THE THICKNESS "1 cm" MAKING THE REQUIREMENT IRRELEVANT

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:

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:

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:

Questions on testing

Q7 Do you agree to removing the Filling 1 option?

☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: There is still considerable product in the market where there is no fibre wear, and a wear if not used in product is another complication. Both options should be available.

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: Consistent foam & fibre compliance will be difficult to cover fabric testing. How to verify is crucial to ensure consistent & accurate results.

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

☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Because the definitions in the proposal are too complicated.

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

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

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

☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure

Comments: Again too complicated.

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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:

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: TEXT AS LONG AS THERE IS SPACE CONSIDERED ON WHAT CAN BE WRITTEN.

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:

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

☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

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:

☐ Nothing ☑ Not sure

THIS IS THE ONLY ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL THAT IS A BENEFIT ALL OTHER PROPOSALS ARE TOO COMPLICATED.

Q20 How much do you estimate you would save per year from reduced use of flame retardants?

Amount saved:

☐ 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:

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

Annex 5: Research references

Scientific Opinion on Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) in Food: Brominated Phenols and their Derivatives

www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2634.htm

Scientific Opinion on Emerging and Novel Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) in Food

www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2908.htm

In Utero and Childhood Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDE) Exposures and Neurodevelopment in the CHAMACOS Study

www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3569691/

Prenatal Exposure to PBDEs and Neurodevelopment

www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2866690/

Prenatal Exposure to Organohalogens, Including Brominated Flame Retardants, Influences Motor, Cognitive, and Behavioural Performance at School Age

www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2799472/

Barceló, D and Eljarrat, E (eds), The Handbook of Environmental Chemistry, Vol 16, '*Brominated Flame Retardants*', Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011

Law et al, Environment International 65, 2014, pp.147-158

Kim et al, Chemosphere 106, 2014, pp.1-19 43