1o. /enerally we do not agree with derogation and 'inisterial control creeping into the processes as they are not e!perts in this field and will not fully understand the inpact from an enforce entipoint of view. @owever), arlia entialready has this power

There ust be positive obligations to report the actions) and the outco es in each case to 'arket Surveillance –uthorities.

%&6, '' <sub>+</sub>

Aes. It should be for all products as so e products pose risks without the necessary infor ation being provided. Consu ers ake purchasing decisions based on that infor ation) and 7uite often that will be the infor ation they take forward to use the product. Therefore) if that infor ation is not co plete or correct a risk ay arise.

See 7uestion 1J.

Consu ers should be clearly infor ed within the online environ ent if they are leaving the regulatory regi e of the 34.

/reater clarity on 8, SS\*s re it and role would be desirable. Currently) there is not a clear division of responsibilities and obligations within the current fra ework and feedback fro the profession is that this is not always clear) whereby 8, SS would t 8, ()18.932()-5.92737

regulatory delivery and role of the local TSS supporting a national regulator + it\*s critical to have the local capacity to ake this effective. CTSI would have concerns over any ove to centralisation and the unintended conse7uence of >ocal -uthority cuts enabling the to step away fro what should be statutory duties.

CTSI would ask for further conversation and consideration around a general statutory copetency re7uire ent which would include a re7uire ent for, roduct Safety enforce ent officers to be suitably 7ualified and to aintain their copetency over tile. This statutory re7uire ent could be fulfilled through the elisting CTSI 7ualification fralework and Chartered Trading Standards, ractitioner definitions. This would provide assurance to businesses that officers aintain necessary knowledge and skills for the areas of law they enforce.

The new statutory co petency re7uire ent could be backed up by a supporting Code of , ractice. The Code would be drawn up by 8, SS O CTSI and other interested parties. It could set out the 7ualifications and co petencies officers in Trading Standards Services should possess for the work they perfor and how they can be assessed and aintained. 6efining 7ualifications and co petencies through a Code of , ractice will provide assurance to businesses and signpost e ployers to a fle!ible tool and enable Trading Standards Services to bench ark their officers\* skills and co petencies. It will also enable local authorities ore fle!ibility in resourcing and structuring their services) perhaps specialising in certain areas) and cooperating with neighbouring authorities) especially at a ti e of increased budgetary pressures.

This reco endation would be consistent with the approach taken by the "ood Standards –gency and the @ealth and Safety 2!ecutive.

%&9, " +

Aes. -t the o ent the data that is necessary for t

There have been past concerns about engage ent and relationships between 8, SS and local TS. This needs to be addressed and a real partnership established in order for a S, 8C syste to work effectively.

It is noted however that /, SR Regulation = notifications are rare and a significant proportion relate to recalls for 7uality issues rather than serious safety breaches.

There has been a significant shift to trading fro ho e) facilitated to so e degree by the services of online arketplaces) ease of creating a web site) and option to use fulfil ent services. In any cases) operators of such businesses have little understanding of the legislative fra ework that they are e!pected to co ply with. -n individual with no e!perience or knowledge can easily i port goods) store the at ho e or at a fulfil ent house) and offer the to consu ers without ever taking any steps to confir safety or co pliance.

8btaining a warrant to visit a business operated fro ho e is an e!tre ely e!pensive process) by way of officer and court ti e. -ny enforce ent visit would be restricted to areas used for the business) e.g.) anufacture9storage space or si ply a desk with a laptop. -ccess to other areas would not generally be sought) unless there was reason to believe that so ething was being concealed. There would likely be concerns about invasion of privacy. It is suggested that additional safeguards would be needed) either via a court warrant or a si ilar authorisation regi e to RI, -could apply to show intelligence and proportionality.