World Health Organization
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR Europe

EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH PROCESS

School environment:

Policies and current status

Abstract

This report includes a summary of existing policies on providing healthy environments in schools and kindergartens, an overview of environmental risk factors in schools, information on design, methods and results of selected recently conducted exposure assessment surveys and a summary of pupils' exposures to major environmental factors, such as selected indoor air pollutants, mould and dampness and poor ventilation in classrooms, sanitation and hygiene problems, smoking and the use of various modes of transportation to school. While most Member States have comprehensive policies aiming at providing healthy environment for pupils, implementing and enforcing some of these policies is a common challenge. Further efforts are needed to improve school sanitation, provide adequate ventilation, prevent dampness and mould growth, reduce emission of indoor air pollutants, improve enforcement of existing smoking bans, facilitate the use of active transportation modes in some countries. Facilitating the use of harmonized monitoring method is essential for closing existing data gaps, identifying and addressing environmental risk factors in schools.

KEYWORDS

AIR POLLUTION, INDOOR
CHILDREN
ENVIRONMENTAL EXPOSURE
EUROPE
HEALTH POLICY
SCHOOL HEALTH

Address requests about publications of the WHO Regional Office for Europe to:
Publications
WHO Regional Office for Europe
UN City
Marmorvej 51
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
Alternatively, complete an online request form for documentation, health information, or for permission to quote or translate, on the Regional Office web site (http://www.euro.who.int/pubrequest).

Citation advice:
School environment: policies and current status. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2015.

© World Health Organization 2015
All rights reserved. The Regional Office for Europe of the World Health Organization welcomes requests for permission to reproduce or translate its publications, in part or in full.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the World Health Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the World Health Organization in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by the World Health Organization to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either express or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall the World Health Organization be liable for damages arising from its use. The views expressed by authors, editors, or expert groups do not necessarily represent the decisions or the stated policy of the World Health Organization.

Design: Christophe Lanoux, Paris, France
Layout: Marta Pasqualato, Treviso, Italy
Cover photo: © Christian Gapp

Contents

List of tables iv

List of figures v

Contributors vi

List of abbreviations vii

Executive summary ix

1. Introduction 1

2. Policies aiming at improving the school environment 2

2.1 Sources of data 2

2.2 Policies to prevent exposure to chemical indoor air pollutants, mould and physical factors in schools and kindergartens 3

2.3 Policies to improve access to sanitation and hygiene practices in schools and kindergartens 9

2.4 Policies to promote walking and cycling to schools, and other forms of physical activity in schools 12

3. Information on the indoor environment in schools and kindergartens 14

3.1 Overview of monitoring methods and their applications to assess exposures in schools in the WHO European Region 14

3.2 Examples of recent and ongoing exposure assessment surveys in the WHO European Region 27

4. Summary of exposure to EH risk factors in schools 57

4.1 Exposure to chemical indoor air pollutants 57

4.2 Exposure to dampness/mould in schools 57

4.3 CO_2 levels and ventilation in classrooms 59

4.4 Sanitation and hygiene in schools 59

4.5 Smoking in schools 60

4.6 Walking and cycling to schools 61

4.7 General conclusions 62

5. References 63

List of tables

Table 1. Summary of results of WHO policy questionnaire, IAQ policies section: analysis by GNI per capita based groupings 4

Table 2. Summary of results of WHO policy questionnaire, hygiene and sanitation policies section: analysis by GNI per capita based groupings 10

Table 3. Summary of answers to the WHO policy questionnaire, sections related to promoting safe physical activities in schools and kindergartens....13

Table 4. Standards/methods for indoor air monitoring....15

Table 5. Summary of WHO IAQ guideline limits for selected pollutants 17

Table 6. Selected projects involving monitoring of priority pollutants in indoor air. 18

Table 7. Indoor environment in schools: physical factors, measurement methods and reference values 28

Table 8. Summary of exposure assessment surveys in schools presented in the report 29

Table 9. Average levels of indoor air pollutants in schools....30

Table 10. Results of a non-systematic internet search for school building monitoring programmes in municipalities in Germany 38

Table 11. Elevated pollutant concentrations in public buildings: data from the "Classical Pollutants" monitoring programme in Cologne, Germany (1989–2003)....40

Table 12. Parameters, measurements, and assessment criteria of the school monitoring programme, "Active Health Care", in Cologne, Germany....41

Table 13. Results of the "Active Health Care" programme, Cologne, Germany 42

Table 14. Summary of data collection 44

Table 15. Summary of monitoring results for NO_2 (µg/m^3)....45

Table 16. Summary of monitoring results for benzene (µg/m^3) 46

Table 17. Summary of monitoring results for formaldehyde (µg/m^3) 46

Table 18. Overview of air exchange and ventilation rates from the WHO Schools Survey pilot studies (2011–2013) 48

Table 19. Country-level estimates of the percent of time that pupils are exposed to mould and dampness in schools 49

List of figures

Fig. 1. Member States that responded to the WHO policy questionnaire 3

Fig. 2. The effect of reverberation on noise and speech understandability – the Lombard effect 28

Fig. 3. Average ratios of indoor and outdoor concentrations of pollutants in schools 31

Fig. 4. Percent of children with specific symptoms by classroom occupation density 31

Fig. 5. Countries that participated in the SINPHONIE project 33

Fig. 6. Percent of pupils' person-time in classrooms spent at specific CO_2 concentrations (ppm) 47

Fig. 7. Example of CO_2 accumulation in a classroom with poor ventilation.....47

Fig. 8. Example of temperature and relative humidity patterns during two school days in a non-heated classroom 50

Fig. 9. Percent of pupils who answered positively to selected questions about sanitation facilities in schools.....51

Fig. 10. Selected results of inspections of sanitation facilities in schools 52

Fig. 11. Percent of pupils who reported smoking in general and smoking in the school or on the school ground, by age 53

Fig. 12. Percent of school employees who answered positively to questions about school smoking bans 54

Fig. 13. Percent of pupils using different modes of transportation (cycling, private car, public transport or walking) 54

Contributors

The report was compiled and edited by Andrey Egorov (WHO European Centre for Environment and Health, Bonn, Germany).

Marco Martuzzi, Oliver Schmoll and Marie-Eve Heroux (WHO European Centre for Environment and Health), and Michal Krzyzanowski (King's College, London, the United Kingdom) reviewed the report and made valuable comments and edits.

The following experts contributed to drafting specific sections of the report:

- Otto Hänninen, Ulla Haverinen-Shaughnessy and Martin Täubel (THL, Kuopio, Finland)
- Otmar Geiss, Stylianos Kephalopoulos and Josefa Barrero (Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, Ispra, Italy)
- Claudia Wendland and Irina Kozban (Women in Europe for a Common Future, Hamburg, Germany)
- Gerhard Wiesmüller and Christof Kaesler (Stadt Köln Gesundheitsamt, Cologne, Germany)
- Eva Csobod (Regional Environmental Centre, Budapest, Hungary)
- Peter Rudnai (National Institute of Environmental Health, Budapest, Hungary)
- Nana Gabriadze (National Center for Disease Control and Public Health, Tbilisi, Georgia)
- Corinne Mandin (Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment, Marne-la-Vallée, France)
- Andrey Egorov, Enkhtsetseg Shinee and Marie-Eve Heroux (WHO European Centre for Environment and Health)
- Francesca Racioppi and Kristina Mauer-Stender (WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen, Denmark).

The following national institutions and experts coordinated national data collection programmes for the WHO Schools Survey (Section 3.2.6):

- Albania: National Public Health Institute, Tirana (national survey coordinator Elida Mataj)
- Croatia: National Institute of Public Health, Zagreb (coordinator Andreja Barišin) and Osijek-Baranya County Institute of Public Health, Osijek (coordinator Dario Brdaric)
- Estonia: National Health Board, Tallinn (coordinators Marje Muusikus and Kristina Aidla-Bauvald)
- Latvia: Public Health Division, Health Inspectorate, Riga (coordinators Ilze Burtniece and Madara Vegnere)
- Lithuania: Centre for Health Education and Disease Prevention, Vilnius (coordinators Ingrida Zurlyté, Olita Rusickaité and Daiva Žeromskiené).

Andrey Egorov (WHO European Centre for Environment and Health) coordinated the development of the WHO Schools Survey protocol and technical support to national surveys. Alexandra Kulinkina and Michael Sellitto (interns, WHO European Centre for Environment and Health), Otto Hänninen (THL, Finland), Elena Naumova and Alexander Liss (Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, United States of America) contributed to processing and analysis of the WHO Schools Survey data.

Stephanie Sangalang (University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany) contributed to language editing.

Bianca Bortot (WHO European Centre for Environment and Health) contributed to copy-editing and report production.

List of abbreviations

ALSPAC	Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
ASHRAE	American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers
BaP	benzo[α]pyrene
BRE	Building Research Establishment
BUMA	Prioritization of BUilding MAterials Emissions as indoor pollution sources
CAS	Chemical Abstracts Service
CEHAPE	Children's Environment and Health Action Plan for Europe
CEN	European Committee for Standardization
CSTB	"Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment" (Scientific and Technical Centre for Building)
dB(A)	decibel A filter
DG SANCO	Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (European Commission)
DIN	"Deutsches Institut für Normung" (German Institute for Standardization)
DVGW	Deutsche Vereinigung des Gas- und Wasserfaches (German Technical and Scientific Association for Gas and Water)
EECCA	eastern Europe, Caucasus and central Asia
EN	Euro Norm
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EU	European Union
FLIES	Flanders Indoor Exposure Survey
GC/MS	gas chromatography/mass spectrometry
GC-MS/FID	gas chromatography – mass spectrometer/flame ionization detector
GerES IV	German Environmental Survey for Children
GNI	gross national income
GYTS	Global Youth Tobacco Survey
HESE	Health Effects of School Environment study
HITEA	Health Effects of Indoor Pollutants: Integrating microbial, toxicological and epidemiological approaches study
HPLC	High-performance liquid chromatography
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
IAQ	indoor air quality
IDMEC-FEUP	Instituto de Engenharia Mecânica, Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto (Portugal) [Institute of Mechanical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto (Portugal)]
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
IEQ	Indoor environmental quality
IMELS	Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea
ISO	International Standards Organisation
JRC	European Commission Joint Research Centre
JRC IES	JRC Institute for Environment and Sustainability
JRC IHCP	JRC Institute for Health and Consumer Protection
KTL	Kansanterveyslaitos (National Public Health Institute of Finland)

lps pp	litre per second per person
lux or lx	illuminance and luminous emittance
MACBETH	Monitoring of Atmospheric Concentration of Benzene in European Towns and Homes project
MVOCs	microbial volatile organic compounds
NDIR	non-dispersive infrared
NIEH	National Institute of Environmental Health (Hungary)
NOx	mono-nitrogen oxides (e.g. NO [nitric oxide] and NO_2 [nitrogen dioxide])
OFFICAIR	On the reduction of health effects from combined exposure to indoor air pollutants in modern offices project
OQAI	Observatoire de la qualité de l'air intérieur (French: Observatory of Indoor Air Quality)
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PCDDs	polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxin
PCDF	polychlorinated dibenzofuran
PCP	pentachlorophenol
PDMS	polydimethylsiloxane
PEOPLE	Exposição da População a Poluentes Atmosféricos na Europa (Portuguese: Population Exposure to Air Pollutants in Europe)
PM	particulate matter
ppm	parts per million
PUF	polyurethane foam
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
REC	Regional Environmental Center, Hungary
REHVA	Federation of European Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Associations (formerly known as "Representatives of European Heating and Ventilating Associations")
RH	relative humidity
RPG	Regional Priority Goal
SEARCH	School Environment And Respiratory health of CHildren project
SINPHONIE	Schools INdoor Pollution and Health – Observatory Network In Europe
SOPs	standard operating procedures
SVOC	semi-volatile organic compounds
T	temperature
THL	Terveyden ja hyvinvoinnin laitos (Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare)
UBA	Umweltbundesamt (German Federal Environment Agency)
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VDI	Verein Deutscher Ingenieure (Association of German Engineers)
VITO	Vlaamse Instelling voor Technologisch Onderzoek (Flemish Institute for Technological Research)
VOC	volatile organic compound
WASH	water, sanitation and hygiene
WECF	Women in Europe for a Common Future

Executive summary

This report presents the results of analysis of questionnaire data on policies aiming at improving environment and health (EH) conditions in schools and kindergartens, summarizes environmental monitoring methods applicable to schools, and describes design and findings of recent international surveys in schools in the WHO European Region as well as selected national surveys. The report focuses on the status of implementation of Parma Declaration commitments related to the school environment: providing access to water and sanitation in children's facilities, ensuring that the indoor air quality (IAQ) is in compliance with WHO guidelines, eliminating smoking in schools and ensuring that children can safely walk and cycle to schools.

In this report, the main source of data on EH policies related to schools and kindergartens is a policy questionnaire developed by the WHO Regional Office for Europe. The questionnaire, which was sent to national EH focal points in the Member States in early 2014, contains sections on policies to provide access to sanitation and hygiene, to ensure adequate IAQ, and to prevent injuries and facilitate physical activities in schools and kindergartens including questions on policies aimed at enabling children to walk and cycle to schools. Another source of information on IAQ policies and recommendations on targeted interventions aimed at improving IAQ in schools was the recently completed Schools Indoor Pollution and Health: Observatory Network in Europe (SINPHONIE) project.

Exposure assessment surveys presented in this report include three recently conducted international surveys of IAQ in schools and kindergartens in the European Region, a national IAQ monitoring survey in France, a municipal monitoring programme in the city of Cologne (as an example of municipal school surveys in Germany), a set of pilot surveys in volunteering Member States using a standardized WHO methodology to assess IAQ, sanitation, hygiene, smoking and mode of transportation to schools (WHO Schools Survey), and a survey sponsored by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in Georgia, which focused on sanitation and hygiene.

The first international survey described in the report is the School Environment and Respiratory Health of Children (SEARCH) project, which involved IAQ monitoring and respiratory health examinations in ten countries including European Union (EU) Member States, and non-EU countries in eastern Europe and central Asia.

The second international survey, SINPHONIE is the most extensive survey on IAQ and health in European schools conducted to date. Twenty three EU countries monitored exposures to an extensive set of chemical and biological pollutants, and conducted assessments of health status of pupils. The project involved a small sample of schools in each country (three to six schools) to provide a snapshot of conditions in different geographic subregions of Europe.

The third international survey, Health Effects of Indoor Pollutants: Integrating Microbial, Toxicological and Epidemiological Approaches (HITEA) was conducted in three EU Member States (Finland, the Netherlands and Spain). Its primary goal was to assess exposures to indoor dampness and biological air pollutants and characterize their associations with respiratory health effects.

The national school environment monitoring programme in France includes a recently completed national pilot survey, ongoing large national survey in a random sample of schools across the country and recently initiated compulsory IAQ monitoring in all schools and kindergartens

in the country. While the national survey involves extensive measurements of many chemical pollutants and assessment of ventilation and exposure to physical factors in schools, the compulsory monitoring programme covers only a short list of environmental hazards: formaldehyde, benzene, and CO_2 as a marker of exposure to stuffy air. This is the only comprehensive national programme in the WHO European Region involving IAQ monitoring in all schools.

While Germany does not have a national monitoring programme in schools, many large German cities developed comprehensive municipal monitoring programmes. One such programme in the city of Cologne is described in details as an example of a local initiative aimed at thoroughly assessing environmental conditions in schools, and providing information for corrective actions and exposure prevention policies at the city level.

The WHO European Centre for Environment and Health (ECEH) has developed, in collaboration with partner institutions, a standardized methodology for exposure assessment surveys in schools aiming at providing a comprehensive assessment of exposures in relation to time-bound Parma Declaration commitments to improve sanitation/hygiene, bring IAQ in compliance with WHO guidelines, prevent smoking and facilitate walking and cycling to schools. The WHO Schools Survey protocol involves measurements of selected IAQ pollutants, detailed inspection of school premises for mould and dampness, CO_2 monitoring and assessment of ventilation rates in classrooms, detailed interviews with school administration, and questionnaires for teachers and pupils. So far, national surveys have been completed in five countries. Several more national surveys are ongoing or in preparation.

The last survey described in this report, the national survey of sanitation and hygiene in public schools in Georgia was conducted in 2013 using a standardized methodology developed by UNICEF. It involved interviews and extensive inspections conducted in a random sample of approximately 300 schools across the country.

The following conclusions are based on the analysis of data from these policy questionnaires and exposure assessment surveys:

1. Access to adequate sanitation facilities and hygiene practices.

    a. Most countries have comprehensive policies aimed at improving sanitation and hygiene in schools and kindergartens. The analysis of data by income grouping using the World Bank's classification of countries demonstrates that policies in low-income and middle-income countries tend to be even more comprehensive than in high-income countries (with the exception of policies aimed at ensuring privacy in toilets).

    b. Improving sanitation and hygiene in schools remains a challenge in countries with limited resources despite the existence of standards and regulations. Surveys conducted by WHO and UNICEF in two middle-income countries demonstrated substantial deficiencies in school sanitation and hygiene. The challenges include poor infrastructure and inadequate operation and maintenance of facilities. As a result, pupils have low satisfaction with toilets and hygiene facilities and, in some cases, avoid using them. Improving inspections taking into account pupils' perceptions and needs, and strengthening enforcement of compliance with the existing standards would be an essential step towards addressing these problems.

    c. At the policy level, setting firm targets for improving sanitation and hygiene in schools under the Protocol of Water and Health supports necessary resource allocation and ensures progress towards the goals set in the Parma Declaration.

2. Indoor air quality in schools.

   a. There is an important gap in data on exposures to indoor air pollutants and mould/dampness in the eastern part of the Region, especially in the Newly Independent States. The application of standardized monitoring methods would facilitate closing this data gap, identifying existing problems, and raising awareness of IAQ issues among school administrators and policy-makers.

   b. Policies aiming at improving IAQ in schools and kindergartens exist in most Member States. IAQ standards specifying maximum allowable levels of indoor air pollutants in schools/kindergartens are more common in high-income countries. Many countries have IAQ standards for non-occupational settings that are not fully in compliance with WHO guidelines.

   c. Member States have a variety of guidelines or standards on ventilation, which are applicable to classrooms. Recommended minimum air exchange rates or ventilation rates are defined using different units and assessment methods. Recommended maximum levels of CO_2 in classrooms (used as a proxy for ventilation rate) vary from 1000 ppm to 1500 ppm.

   d. Based on the available surveillance data, poor ventilation and stuffy air in classrooms is a common problem in some countries during the cold season. Survey in an upper-middle-income country in southeast Europe demonstrated that lack of heating in school buildings is associated with especially poor ventilation and stuffy air in classrooms during the cold season. Detrimental effects of poor ventilation are likely to be substantial and include not only respiratory infections and absenteeism, but also reduced academic performance and well-being of pupils. Assessing the situation across the Region is hampered by the lack of standard approaches to data collection, analysis and interpretation. Another serious limitation is a lack of data from most low-income and lower-middle-income Member States in the eastern part of the Region.

   e. Exposures to mould and dampness are rather common in some countries. Adverse effects of such exposure on respiratory health are well established. A substantial school-to-school variability in exposure to mould and dampness within specific countries suggests that targeted interventions focused on problematic schools would be an efficient approach.

   f. Recently conducted surveys did not detect levels of formaldehyde in excess of the WHO IAQ guideline. Classrooms with high levels of other chemical air pollutants originating from indoor sources, such as benzene, VOCs and PAHs, were detected in some countries. The lack of data for many low-income and lower-middle-income countries does not allow generalization of findings to the entire Region. Substantial experience with preventing exposure to chemical pollutants in some EU countries demonstrates the effectiveness of policy interventions. Actions aiming at improving awareness of health effects of indoor air pollution and approaches to reducing emissions from indoor sources should be further promoted.

3. Exposure to physical factors in the school environment.

   a. Most countries have standards on minimum and/or maximum indoor air temperature in schools.

   b. Despite the existence of indoor temperature standard, a lack of centralized heating in many schools in an upper-middle-income country in south-eastern Europe was associated with uncomfortably low

air temperature, poor ventilation and high relative humidity in classrooms during the cold season. The lack on monitoring data on other countries with similar conditions does not allow further generalization of this finding.

c. Monitoring data on classrooms acoustics, noise level, lighting and other physical factors is rather limited. Assessing exposure to physical factors should be promoted as a step towards creating comfortable school environment and facilitating learning.

4. Health-related behavioural factors.

a. The results of WHO Schools Survey in five volunteering Member States demonstrate that the prevalence of smoking increases with age at different rates in different countries. Overall, almost one half of children who reported smoking during the past month also reported that they smoke in the school. In one high income country in southeast Europe, prevalence rates of self-reported smoking in general and smoking in schools among 16 years old pupils were 42% and 29% respectively. The lowest rates of smoking among 16 years old pupils were reported in another high-income country located in northeast Europe: 19% for smoking in general and 10% for smoking in the school. Adult individuals are still permitted to smoke inside some schools.

b. Data from WHO surveys in five countries in Europe demonstrate that walking tends to be the most common mode of transportation to school, while using bicycles is rather uncommon. Analysis of responses to policy questionnaire also suggests the need to improve the infrastructure supporting the safe use of bicycles as a mode of transport.

1. Introduction

In 2010, the Fifth Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health, held in Italy, adopted the Parma Declaration on Environment and Health. Section A of the Declaration, "Protecting children's health", specifies four Regional Priority Goals (RPGs). Three of these RPGs include time-bound commitments to protect health and prevent diseases through improving the environment in children's facilities, including schools and kindergartens:

> *Regional Priority Goal 1. Ensuring public health by improving access to safe water and sanitation*
>
> *[Commitment] ii We will strive to provide each child with access to safe water and sanitation in homes, child care centres, kindergartens, schools, health care institutions and public recreational water settings by 2020, and to revitalize hygiene practices.*
>
> *Regional Priority Goal 2. Addressing obesity and injuries through safe environments, physical activity and healthy diet*
>
> *[Commitment] iv We aim to provide each child by 2020 with access to healthy and safe environments and settings of daily life in which they can walk and cycle to kindergartens and schools…*
>
> *Regional Priority Goal 3. Preventing disease through improved outdoor and indoor air quality*
>
> *[Commitment] iii We aim to provide each child with a healthy indoor environment in child care facilities, kindergartens, schools and public recreational settings, implementing WHO's indoor air quality guidelines and, as guided by the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, ensuring that these environments are tobacco smoke-free by 2015.*

This report summarizes recently collected data on policies aimed at improving the environment in schools and kindergartens, as well as results of recently conducted international and selected national surveys which assessed exposures to environmental hazards in schools and kindergartens. The report is not intended as a comprehensive evaluation of all available data on environmental quality in schools, as that would require analysis of literature in multiple languages and access to so-called "grey literature" which has not been formally published. Instead, the report provides a snapshot of conditions and points at commonly detected problems, based on published and yet unpublished results of recently conducted surveys. It also identifies data gaps and suggests further efforts to quantify exposures to harmful factors in schools across the Region and to assess their adverse impacts on health.

While a majority of Members States responded to the WHO policy questionnaire, the response rate was below average among countries in the eastern part of the Region. Similarly, the available data from recent EU-funded international exposure assessment surveys include mainly EU Member States. Therefore, the available information on the eastern part of the Region is not sufficient for characterizing spatial patterns. Further efforts are necessary in order to close the existing data gap and support targeted interventions in countries with limited internal resources.

2. Policies aiming at improving the school environment

2.1 Sources of data

2.1.1 WHO policy questionnaire

In order to assess the situation at national and subnational levels, WHO developed and administered an environment and health policy questionnaire to National Environment and Health Focal Points in the WHO European Region. The questionnaire included six sections covering:
(A) sanitation and hygiene in schools and kindergartens,
(B) physical activity and injury prevention,
(C) indoor air quality (IAQ) in schools and kindergartens,
(D) prevention of asbestos-related disease,
(E) youth's participation in the environment and health process, and
(F) suggestions regarding EH challenges to be addressed at the 6th Ministerial Conference.

Sections A and C of the questionnaire, and some questions in section B, aimed at assessing policies related to the environment in schools and kindergartens. Thirty-two Member States (Fig. 1) submitted responses by the deadline in April 2014. Four more Member States (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, the United Kingdom), submitted responses during the rest of 2014; these additional data were used in the analysis of policies on sanitation and hygiene only. The responding Member States are grouped according to the World Bank's classification based on gross national income (GNI) per capita for 2012 (World Bank, 2015) (Fig. 1).

2.1.2 Policy component of the SINPHONIE project

The European Commission adopted the European Union (EU) Environment and Health Action Plan 2004–2010 in June 2004 as the first cycle in the implementation of the European Environment and Health Strategy (EU, 2004b). The action plan was an operational document that specified 13 key actions to be carried out until 2010. Among them, Action 12 concerned the "improvement of indoor air quality". In this context, the SINPHONIE project (Schools INdoor Pollution and Health – Observatory Network In Europe) (Csobod et al., 2014), was funded by the European Parliament and supported by the European Commission Directorate General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO).

SINPHONIE was the first Europe-wide pilot project (involving 23 countries, including EU Member States and accession countries) to monitor IAQ and other factors related to the school environment and children's health. This two-year project (2010–2012) brought together the multidisciplinary expertise of almost 40 partner institutions. SINPHONIE supported the implementation of the WHO Regional Priority Goal 3 *Preventing disease through improved outdoor and indoor air quality*, and followed up on the objectives and targets outlined in the Parma Declaration (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2010a).

The SINPHONIE project established a network of actors at European level, who would work with a long-term perspective of improving air quality in schools and kindergartens in order to reduce the burden of respiratory diseases and improve children's well-being and learning success. The project provided an evidence base to support future policy actions and produced recommendations and risk management options for improving air quality and reducing adverse health effects of environmental factors in schools.

Fig. 1. Member States that responded to the WHO policy questionnaire



The designations employed and the presentation of this material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the World Health Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers and boundaries.
Dotted and dashed lines on maps represent approximate borders for which there may be not full agreement.

Cartography by Pierpaolo Mudu (WHO)
© WHO Regional Office for Europe 2015
All rights reserved

World Health Organization
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR Europe

Note: Andorra, Monaco and San Marino did not submit responses by the deadline; Malta, which belongs to the high-income group, submitted a completed questionnaire.

2.2 Policies to prevent exposure to chemical indoor air pollutants, mould and physical factors in schools and kindergartens

2.2.1 Results of the WHO policy questionnaire

Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) policies and standards

The results of WHO policy questionnaire data (Table 1) show that 14 out of 31 responding countries (45%) have health-based standards for IAQ for non-occupational settings applicable to schools and kindergartens. The main pollutants covered by these standards are formaldehyde (12 countries, 39%), carbon monoxide (9 countries, 29%), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) (8 countries, 26%) and benzene (7 countries, 23%). Twelve countries (39%) have standards for at least one or more indoor air pollutants which are not listed above (e.g. volatile organic compounds (VOCs), particulate matter (PM), asbestos or radon). Standard sampling duration for the same pollutant tends to differ in various countries limiting the comparability of national standards. When comparison is made with WHO IAQ guidelines for selected chemicals, the following patterns emerge.

- For formaldehyde, a total of nine countries — Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal and Slovakia (29%) — have standard values equal to or below the WHO guideline of 0.1 mg/m^3 for 30-min average (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2010b).

- For carbon monoxide, WHO recommends four different limits

Table 1. Summary of results of WHO policy questionnaire, IAQ policies section: analysis by GNI per capita based groupings

Policy	GNI per capita based grouping of Member States			
	High	Upper-middle	Low and lower-middle	All
1. Authority responsible for IAQ in kindergartens and schools	**15/21 (71%)**	**3/7 (43%)**	**3/3 (100%)**	**21/31 (68%)**
2. Health-based IAQ standards for non-occupational settings	**12/21 (57%)**	**1/7 (14%)**	**1/3 (33%)**	**14/31 (45%)**
Formaldehyde	11/21 (52%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	12/31 (39%)
NO_2	7/21 (33%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	8/31 (26%)
Benzene	6/21 (29%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	7/31 (23%)
Carbon monoxide	8/21 (38%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	9/31 (29%)
Other chemical pollutants	11/21 (52%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	12/31 (39%)
3. Regular IAQ surveillance	**5/20 (25%)**	**0/7 (0%)**	**1/3 (33%)**	**6/30 (2%)**
Measurements are conducted in response to IAQ complaints	5/20 (25%)	0/7 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	5/30 (17%)
Regular monitoring of IAQ in randomly selected facilities	1/20 (5%)	0/7 (0%)	1/3 (33%)	2/30 (7%)
Formaldehyde	5/20 (25%)	0/7 (0%)	1/3 (33%)	6/30 (20%)
NO_2	5/20 (25%)	0/7 (0%)	1/3 (33%)	6/30 (20%)
Benzene	4/20 (20%)	0/7 (0%)	1/3 (33%)	5/30 (17%)
Carbon monoxide	3/20 (15%)	0/7 (0%)	1/3 (33%)	4/30 (13%)
Other chemical pollutants	5/20 (25%)	0/7 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	5/30 (17%)
4. Research projects focusing on IAQ since 2009	**16/21 (76%)**	**4/7 (57%)**	**0/3 (0%)**	**20/31 (65%)**
Formaldehyde	11/21 (52%)	4/7 (57%)	0/3 (0%)	15/31 (48%)
NO_2	9/21 (43%)	4/7 (57%)	0/3 (0%)	13/31 (42%)
Benzene	7/21 (33%)	4/7 (57%)	0/3 (0%)	11/31 (35%)
Carbon monoxide	8/21 (38%)	3/7 (43%)	0/3 (0%)	11/31 (35%)
Other chemical pollutants	13/21 (62%)	3/7 (43%)	0/3 (0%)	16/31 (52%)
Moulds	9/21 (43%)	2/7 (29%)	0/3 (0%)	11/31 (35%)
5. Policy to control indoor levels of formaldehyde and VOCs	**12/20 (60%)**	**1/7 (14%)**	**0/3 (0%)**	**13/30 (43%)**
Procedures for addressing complaints about chemical smell	5/20 (25%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	6/30 (20%)
Requirements to use low emissions construction materials	5/20 (25%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	6/30 (20%)
6. Policy to prevent exposure to mould	**15/21 (71%)**	**3/7 (43%)**	**0/3 (0%)**	**18/31 (58%)**
Provisions for regular inspections of buildings	4/21 (19%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	5/31 (16%)

Table 1 (concluded)

Policy	GNI per capita based grouping of Member States			
	High	Upper-middle	Low and lower-middle	All
Inspection of buildings in response to complaints	9/21 (43%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	10/31 (32%)
Prompt actions to eliminate the source of exposure	8/21 (38%)	0/7 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	8/31 (26%)
7. Requirements for indoor air temperature	**19/21 (90%)**	**6/7 (86%)**	**3/3 (100%)**	**28/31 (90%)**
8. Ventilation requirements	**18/20 (90%)**	**5/7 (71%)**	**2/3 (67%)**	**25/30 (83%)**
The policy sets the minimum ventilation rate	11/20 (55%)	4/7 (57%)	1/3 (33%)	16/30 (53%)
The policy sets the maximum allowable CO_2 level	10/20 (50%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	11/30 (37%)
The policy includes monitoring requirements	2/20 (10%)	0/7 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	2/30 (7%)
9. Policy to prevent exposure from indoor combustion sources	**5/19 (26%)**	**3/7 (43%)**	**0/3 (0%)**	**8/29 (28%)**
Facilities with indoor combustion have to have carbon monoxide detectors	2/19 (11%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	3/29 (10%)
10. Policy to prevent chemical contamination	**8/20 (40%)**	**4/7 (57%)**	**3/3 (100%)**	**15/30 (50%)**
Minimum distance to major roads, refuelling stations, etc.	5/20 (25%)	3/7 (43%)	3/3 (100%)	11/30 (37%)
Minimum distance to factories emitting toxic chemicals	5/20 (25%)	2/7 (29%)	1/3 (33%)	8/30 (27%)
11. New policies introduced after Parma	**8/19 (42%)**	**3/7 (43%)**	**0/3 (0%)**	**11/29 (38%)**

Note: Data are presented as number of positive responses / total number of responses (percent of positive responses).

associated with four exposure durations (15 minutes, 1 hour, 8 hours, and 24 hours average concentrations) in order to ensure that the public is protected from the harmful acute effects of short-term high level carbon monoxide exposure (i.e. acute intoxication) as well as from effects of longer-term, lower level exposure (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2010b). While nine countries (29%) have standards for one of these exposure durations, only one responding country (Portugal) has standards for all four exposure durations as recommended by WHO.

- For NO_2, a total of seven countries — Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Slovakia (23%) — have standard values equal to or below the WHO guidelines for short-term exposure (200 µg/m^3 1-hour average); however, only one country (Italy) has a long-term exposure standard for NO_2 as recommended by WHO (40 µg/m^3 annual average).

- For benzene, WHO guidelines state that no safe level of exposure can be recommended, as it is a carcinogen. Various levels of acceptable risk and exposure times have been adopted at

the national level in seven countries (23%). Two countries (Slovakia and Norway) have policies in place to reduce exposure as low as possible.

Policies to control indoor levels of formaldehyde and other VOCs

Thirteen countries (43%) have policies to control indoor levels of formaldehyde and VOCs, including procedures for investigating and addressing complaints about the smell of chemical pollutants (6 countries, 20%) or requiring the use of low emissions construction materials (6 countries, 20%).

Policies on mould and dampness, indoor temperature and ventilation

A total of 18 countries (58%) have policies to prevent exposure to mould, including five countries (16%) with provisions for regularly inspecting school buildings.

Twenty-eight countries (90%) have policies for minimum indoor temperature. The minimum temperature requirements vary by country, and also by season. Three countries — Israel, Malta, Turkey (10%) — located in the warm climate region do not have such policies.

Twenty-three countries (74%) reported specific values for minimum and maximum allowable indoor air temperature in schools and kindergartens. The lowest value for minimum temperature is 15°C for hallways and corridors. Requirements for minimum classroom temperature vary from 17°C to 20°C. Some countries, such as Estonia, Hungary, Slovenia and Montenegro, have higher minimum temperature standards for kindergartens (21°C or 22°C). Fifteen countries (48%) also have standards for maximum indoor air temperature, which vary from 22°C to 29°C, partly depending on the season (with a higher maximum limit for the warm season).

A total of 25 countries (83%) have a policy on ventilation. Among the responding countries, 19 (61%) have either ventilation rate or carbon dioxide (CO_2) level requirements for schools. The minimum ventilation rate was defined for schools in 16 countries (53%). Different units of measurement were used in different countries, such as air flow per unit of floor area, per volume (air exchange rate) and per person (ventilation rate in litres per second per person). It should be noted that because occupant density also varies from country to country, numerical comparisons of the national standards may not be appropriate. Some standards also combined ventilation rates per occupant with additional requirements specifying minimum rate of fresh air inflow per square meter of classroom area. Eleven countries (36.7%) set requirements for maximum CO_2 concentration in the classrooms. Numerical values varied substantially, ranging from less than 1000 parts per million (ppm) to 5000 ppm (it should be noted that the ambient background level of CO_2 is approximately 400 ppm).

Policies on indoor combustion sources

Eight countries (28%) have policies aiming at preventing exposure originating from indoor combustion sources. Six countries (21%) reported that they neither had any indoor combustion sources in schools and kindergartens nor a policy to prevent such exposure. Only three countries (10%) have policies requiring facilities with indoor combustion sources to have carbon monoxide detectors.

Policies to prevent chemical contamination from external sources

Fifteen countries (50%) have policies to prevent chemical contamination or to have physical separation or certain minimum distance between kindergartens and/or schools and major roads, refuelling stations, garages and other facilities for motor vehicles. Eleven countries (37%) have policies that require either a physical separation or specify a minimum distance to such sources; eight countries (27%) require a minimum distance to factories with emission sources of toxic chemicals.

New policies introduced after the Parma conference

Since the Parma Declaration in 2009,

11 countries (36%) have reported the introduction of new policies to address several aspects of IAQ. It should be noted that there are important data gaps, as the situation in many countries was not reported through this survey, especially in the eastern part of the Region. There is a need to continue introducing and enforcing suitable policies, such as IAQ standards, requirements for the use of low emission materials, good ventilation practices, proper maintenance of buildings to prevent water leaks and accumulation of moisture, and control of indoor combustion sources in order to address this environmental risk and reduce exposures in indoor environments where children spend a sizeable portion of their time.

Analysis of policies by income-based groupings

High-income countries were more likely to have IAQ standards for non-occupational settings for specific pollutants, and policies to control indoor levels of formaldehyde and VOCs, compared to upper-middle-income countries (Table 1). None of the three low-income and lower-middle-income countries, which responded to this questionnaire, had such standards. In contrast, all three low- and lower-middle-income countries had policies aimed at preventing chemical contamination or requiring minimum distance between schools/kindergartens and sources of pollution, such as busy roads.

2.2.2 Policy component of the SINPHONIE project

The EU-funded SINPHONIE project involved IAQ monitoring in schools, collection of information on health-related policies in schools and in-depth analysis of data and information in order to produce recommendations for healthy school environments (Kephalopoulos et al., 2014). This section summarizes results of policy evaluation and recommendations. The IAQ monitoring results are discussed in section 3.2.

An overview of information on policy initiatives (regulations, laws, guidelines, programmes) in European countries on healthy school environments (Kephalopoulos et al., 2014) demonstrated that although existing policies vary among countries there are some commonalities in objectives. Many countries have adopted guidelines and recommendations on how to create a healthy indoor environment in schools. These include the design of school buildings, the use of mechanical ventilation, and the use of remediation measures following the detection of problems, such as the presence of mould. For instance, many countries have requirements which are aimed at maintaining basic hygiene and sanitation standards in school buildings, food safety, lighting and ventilation in classrooms. Some of the policies are mandatory, while others are only recommendations.

The SINPHONIE review of national initiatives in EU Member States, accession and candidate countries noted that France and Germany have adopted comprehensive guidelines and recommendations on hygiene and IAQ requirements in schools, measures to control specific indoor air pollutants, indoor climate requirements, and procedures for remediating indoor-environment–related problems.

The German Guidelines for Indoor Air Hygiene in School Buildings were issued in 2008 (UBA, 2008). In France, in the context of the French environmental programme, “Grenelle Environnement” (Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development, Transport and Housing, 2010), mandatory requirements were developed for the regular monitoring and auditing of IAQ in schools and for establishing a labelling system for construction and decorating materials.

The SINPHONIE recommendations on improving IAQ in schools include the following components:

- key drivers for a healthy indoor school environment
- health symptoms and problems, and relevant risk factors

- tips for establishing/maintaining a healthy school environment

- prevention, control, remediation and communication strategies

- policy implementation criteria.

The recommendations are intended to be generally applicable in most school environments in Europe after adapting them to the local context (e.g. specific environmental, social and economic conditions). The recommendations are primarily directed to relevant policy-makers at European and national levels, and local authorities. The second target group includes individuals who are responsible for the design, construction and renovation of school buildings. A third target group comprises school pupils and their parents, teachers and other school staff. The goal is not to replace but to supplement existing national and local guidance documents, which should remain the first point of reference for specialists and policy-makers in specific countries.

The SINPHONIE recommendations are based on a proactive approach that promotes problem prevention, as compared to a reactive approach aiming at solving problems after they appear. In this sense, the establishment of sustainable environmental health programmes targeting schools is encouraged as a holistic, comprehensive, cost-effective and implementable strategy. Such programmes should promote a school environment that is conducive to learning and protective of the health of pupils and staff. The expected benefits include: lower rates of absenteeism among children and teachers; stronger academic performance among pupils and greater participation in the classroom; greater teacher retention and job satisfaction; and cost savings through energy and water conservation and efficiency; and improved facility maintenance.

An important prerequisite of a sustainable school environmental health programme is the design of sustainable school buildings. This is achieved though combining advances in architecture and engineering with traditional climate-specific approaches and regional/local cultural values. The latest advances in decoupling heating and cooling functions from ventilation should be promoted. It is important not only to build schools in non-polluted areas and control outdoor sources of air pollution near schools, but also to control indoor sources of air pollution through the use of low-emitting materials.

Maintaining proper ventilation is important for keeping exposures to indoor pollutants at an acceptable level. The authors of the SINPHONIE policy report (Kephalopoulos et al., 2014) do not consider natural ventilation as the default approach. There is a paradigm shift towards favoring the practical implementation of health-based ventilation guidance, recently developed in the context of the EU-funded HEALTHVENT project (Carrer et al., in press). A health-oriented ventilation strategy should be based on two fundamental principles:

1. the indoor air must fulfill the requirements of WHO air quality guidelines (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2010b); and

2. “source control” is the priority strategy for controlling IAQ and preventing health risks associated with indoor exposures (i.e. eradicating individual sources of pollution or limiting their emissions); while ventilation is only used as a supplementary means to control exposure.

The SINPHONIE recommendations include the following specific approaches:

Location-specific approaches:

- managing urban pollution, including ambient air quality and major sources of air pollution (e.g. transportation, traffic);

- selecting “pollution-free” sites for new schools, promoting compliance with the WHO guidelines for ambient air quality near existing schools, and introducing stricter measures to improve traffic

conditions in the vicinity of schools (e.g. within a radius of 1 km); and

- implementing adequate radon exposure prevention and mitigation strategies.

Building design, construction (including retrofitting) and maintenance:

- holistic approach to school building design, construction, and maintenance; this involves the proper selection of clean (low- or no-emitting) materials for new and retrofitted schools and the integration of features related to energy conservation, IAQ maintenance, and comfort requirements;
- elimination of moisture/mould and allergen sources in the school building;
- developing a strategy for heating and, where necessary, cooling, to ensure satisfactory temperature, relative humidity and ventilation in classrooms;
- the decoupling, as far as possible, of heating/cooling functions from the ventilation function; and
- developing a strategy for ventilation in classrooms and the establishment of minimum ventilation levels expressed in litres per second per person based on health criteria.

Management and use:

- setting and enforcing maximum permitted occupation densities in classrooms;
- periodical monitoring of IAQ in schools and of pertinent health parameters in school pupils;
- the establishment of a manual for the proper management of the school indoor environment, in particular IAQ;
- using low emission cleaning materials;
- using low-emission building materials and materials for activities and teaching;
- informing students, their parents and teachers about the importance of maintaining good IAQ in schools;
- identifying school employees who are personally accountable for the management, maintenance and cleaning of school buildings;
- development and implementation of harmonized methodologies and protocols for IAQ assessments; and
- complete smoking ban in all indoor school spaces.

2.3 Policies to improve access to sanitation and hygiene practices in schools and kindergartens

In the Parma Declaration and Commitment to Act, the Member States made commitments to provide access to safe drinking-water and sanitation to each child in homes, child care centres, kindergartens, schools and other settings by 2020. This section summarizes the findings from the WHO policy questionnaire section on sanitation and hygiene policies in schools and kindergartens. Responses to this section were received from 34 out of 53 Member States (64%). Table 2 provides a summary of responses.

Assessment of the current status of policies

All 34 responding countries have established policies and programmes to ensure children's access to adequate sanitation and hygiene. Also all responding countries have policies specifying minimum parameters, quantity and conditions of sanitation facilities (toilets and washrooms) in schools and pre-schools. A majority of responding countries (23 countries, 68%) have policies setting requirements for a maximum

number of pupils per toilet seat, while 25 countries (74%) have policies to ensure privacy in school toilets. Other commonly reported policies were requirements for having adequate light (26 countries, 76%) and comfortable temperature in toilets and washrooms (also 76%).

Policies on operation and maintenance of sanitation facilities are present in 28 (82%) of responding countries, with 17 countries (50%) having requirements to provide an adequate amount of toilet paper and 20 countries (59%) having requirements for providing soap in hand washing facilities.

Most countries (28 countries, 82%) have policies on hygiene education but only 11 countries (32%) address gender-specific issues in hygiene education. Also a majority of countries (29 countries, 85%) have policies setting requirements for regular surveillance and more than two-thirds (68%) of countries have polices for

Table 2. Summary of results of WHO policy questionnaire, hygiene and sanitation policies section: analysis by GNI per capita based groupings

Policy	GNI per capita based grouping of Member States			
	High	Upper-middle	Low and lower-middle	All
1. Policy specifying minimum parameters	**21/21 (100%)**	**8/8 (100%)**	**5/5 (100%)**	**34/34 (100%)**
Maximum number of pupils per toilet place	15/21 (71%)	5/8 (63%)	3/5 (60%)	23/34 (68%)
Maximum number of pupils per hand wash basin	9/21 (43%)	6/8 (75%)	5/5 (100%)	20/34 (59%)
Adequate light in toilets and washrooms	16/21 (76%)	6/8 (75%)	4/5 (80%)	26/34 (76%)
Comfortable temperature in toilets and washrooms	15/21 (71%)	6/8 (75%)	5/5 (100%)	26/34 (76%)
Privacy standards for toilet cabins	17/21 (81%)	4/8 (50%)	4/5 (80%)	25/34 (74%)
Accessibility for children with disabilities	16/21 (76%)	5/8 (63%)	1/5 (20%)	22/34 (65%)
2. Policy specifying operation and maintenance	**18/21 (86%)**	**5/8 (63%)**	**5/5 (100%)**	**28/34 (82%)**
Provision of adequate amount of toilet paper	11/21 (52%)	4/8 (50%)	2/5 (40%)	17/34 (50%)
Provision of soap in hand washing facilities	13/21 (62%)	4/8 (50%)	3/5 (60%)	20/34 (59%)
Provision of adequate amount of water for hand washing	13/21 (62%)	6/8 (75%)	4/5 (80%)	23/34 (68%)
Provision of towels/driers	13/21 (62%)	4/8 (50%)	4/5 (80%)	21/34 (62%)
Minimum cleaning requirements for sanitation facilities	14/21 (67%)	4/8 (50%)	5/5 (100%)	23/34 (68%)
Regular inspection and maintenance of sanitation facilities	10/21 (48%)	3/8 (38%)	4/5 (80%)	17/34 (50%)
3. Policy on hygiene education	**16/21 (76%)**	**7/8 (88%)**	**5/5 (100%)**	**28/34 (82%)**

Table 2 (concluded)

Policy	GNI per capita based grouping of Member States			
	High	Upper-middle	Low and lower-middle	All
Requires hygiene education to be part of curriculum	10/21 (48%)	6/8 (75%)	3/5 (60%)	19/34 (56%)
Specifies educational minimum requirements	7/21 (33%)	6/8 (75%)	3/5 (60%)	16/34 (47%)
Hygiene education addresses gender-specific aspects	6/21 (29%)	2/8 (25%)	3/5 (60%)	11/34 (32%)
4. Officer responsible for compliance	**14/21 (67%)**	**4/8 (50%)**	**5/5 (100%)**	**23/34 (68%)**
5. Regular surveillance	**16/21 (76%)**	**8/8 (100%)**	**5/5 (100%)**	**29/34 (85%)**
Minimum requirements for inspections	7/21 (33%)	6/8 (75%)	2/5 (40%)	15/34 (44%)
If deficiencies are found, follow-up inspections	14/21 (67%)	7/8 (88%)	5/5 (100%)	26/34 (76%)
6. New policies introduced after Parma	**3/21 (14%)**	**3/8 (38%)**	**2/5 (40%)**	**8/34 (24%)**

Note: Data are presented as number of positive responses / total number of responses (percent of positive responses).

identifying officers who are responsible for ensuring compliance with sanitation and hygiene requirements.

Only eight out of 34 responding countries (24%) have introduced new policies on water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in schools and kindergartens after the Parma Conference: Denmark, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro and Tajikistan.

Five countries that responded to the WHO policy questionnaire also participated in the WHO survey in schools (Albania, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) and one country (Georgia) participated in a UNICEF survey of water and sanitation in schools, which are described in this report. Albania is an upper-middle-income country while Georgia is a lower-middle-income country; the other four countries belong to the group of high-income countries. The WHO and UNICEF surveys in schools demonstrated substantial problems with sanitation and hygiene facilities in schools in the two lower- and upper-middle-income countries (Georgia and Albania), while conditions in the high-income countries were generally satisfactory. At the same time, analysis of policies demonstrated that Albania and Georgia had comprehensive policies comparable to policies in the high-income countries.

Potential areas for further improvements and way forward

- The existing policies appear to be rather strong and comprehensive, especially in the group of low-income and lower-middle-income countries. However, the situation on the ground may differ, as suggested by the results of recently conducted standardized surveys facilitated by WHO and UNICEF (see sections below). Therefore, the existence of a legal framework does not necessarily ensure adequate sanitation in schools and kindergartens. Analysis of available data on policies and on sanitation and hygiene in schools

suggests that the situation is strongly affected by economic factors, which affect the quality of infrastructure and maintenance, as well as adequate monitoring of compliance with existing standards and enforcement mechanisms.

- Not all standards adopted by the responding countries are in accordance with WHO guidelines (Adams et al., 2009). In some countries the required number of available sanitation facilities in schools and kindergartens is lower than what is specified in the WHO guidelines. Almost one third of the countries lacks requirements for hand washing facilities and does not address the issue of accessibility of sanitation facilities for disabled children. Further strengthening of national policies and standards taking into account WHO guidelines is encouraged.

- Subsequently, more meaningful and efficient monitoring, and more transparent and rigorous mechanisms for correcting deficiencies are recommended. This also includes the need to better address pupils' perceptions and needs.

- Water, sanitation and hygiene education should be incorporated in preschool and school curricula. More attention is required to bring gender-specific aspects like menstrual hygiene into the respective educational programmes.

- After the Parma Conference, some countries introduced new policies aimed at implementing the Parma commitments. To a large extent these newly introduced policies focused on setting or improving sanitation and hygiene standards in preschools and primary and secondary schools. Further efforts aimed at implementing and enforcing such policies are encouraged.

Most Member States of the WHO European Region are parties to the Protocol on Water and Health (hereinafter "the Protocol") (UN, 2000). WASH in schools and other child care settings is one of the priority thematic areas under the Protocol 2014–2016 programme of work. The target setting and reporting process under the Protocol is an effective policy instrument to implement the Parma Commitments at a national level. Country-specific targets for WASH in schools and kindergartens help mobilizing necessary internal resources, support incremental improvements and strengthen governmental commitment to achieve sanitation and hygiene-related goals set in the Parma Declaration.

2.4 Policies to promote walking and cycling to schools, and other forms of physical activity in schools

Section B of the WHO policy questionnaire, "Policies to encourage physical activity and prevent injuries," included a question about policies aimed at promoting walking and cycling to schools. All 31 Member States which completed the section B answered this question (Table 3). Eighteen countries (58%) had such policies. These included seven countries (23%) with legally binding standards, nine (29%) with legally non-binding recommendations or guidelines and 12 (39%) with action plans or programmes. Because some countries had more than one type of policy, the total is greater than 18. In 16 countries (52%), policies existed at the national level, while in nine countries (29%), policies existed at the regional or local level (seven of them had policies at national and sub-national levels).

The most common type of policy, found in 14 countries (45%) and aimed at promoting safe walking and cycling to schools, was a requirement to have reduced speed limits near schools. Ten countries (32%) had policies on bicycle

parking facilities at schools and only eight countries (26%) had policies on bicycle lanes leading to schools.

Policies to encourage walking and cycling to schools were most common in the group of high-income countries where 15 out of 21 responders (71%) had such policies. The proportion was lower (3 out of 7 responders, 43%) in the group of upper-middle-income countries; none of the three low- to lower-middle-income countries which responded to this section had such policies.

Two other school and kindergarten-related questions were about policies on required minimum number of physical education in schools (question #2) and policies to equip these facilities with exercise rooms and playgrounds (question #3). Almost all countries (29 out of 30, 97%) had requirements on physical education in schools. These included 25 countries (83%) with legally binding standards on physical education hours (now shown in Table 3). Also a large majority of countries (26 out of 29 responders, 90%) had policies to equip schools and kindergartens with exercise rooms and/or playgrounds. In 23 countries (79%) such policies were legally binding.

Table 3. Summary of answers to the WHO policy questionnaire, sections related to promoting safe physical activities in schools and kindergartens

Question	GNI per capita based grouping of Member States			
	High	Upper-middle	Low and lower-middle	All
2. Required minimum number of physical education hours in schools	**19/20 (95%)**	**7/7 (100%)**	**3/3 (100%)**	**29/30 (97%)**
3. Policy to equip kindergartens and schools with exercise rooms or playgrounds	**16/19 (84%)**	**7/7 (100%)**	**3/3 (100%)**	**26/29 (90%)**
6. Policy to encourage walking and cycling to schools	**15/21 (71%)**	**3/7 (43%)**	**0/3 (0%)**	**18/31 (58%)**
Specific policy measures:				
Requirements to have bicycle lanes leading to schools	7/21 (33%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	8/31 (26%)
Requirements to have bicycle parking facilities at schools	9/21 (43%)	1/7 (14%)	0/3 (0%)	10/31 (32%)
Measures to facilitate walking to schools, such as organized walking of groups of children and supervised street crossings	11/21 (52%)	0/7 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	11/31 (35%)
Reduced speed limits or other traffic calming measures near schools	11/21 (52%)	3/7 (43%)	0/3 (0%)	14/31 (45%)

Note: Data are presented as number of positive responses / total number of responses (percent of positive responses).

3. Information on the indoor environment in schools and kindergartens

3.1 Overview of monitoring methods and their applications to assess exposures in schools in the WHO European Region

3.1.1 Indoor air quality monitoring – chemical air pollutants

Background

A number of chemical compounds, which are commonly found in the indoor environment, are known health hazards. These include benzene, carbon monoxide, formaldehyde, naphthalene, nitrogen dioxide, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) (in particular, benzo[α]pyrene), radon, trichloroethylene and tetrachloroethylene. These compounds are included in the *WHO Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality: Selected Pollutants* (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2010b). For each of these compounds, various sampling and laboratory analysis techniques are available. The use of harmonized sampling and analysis protocols is necessary for producing comparable results in the international context.

Currently, there are no EU directives explicitly prescribing a monitoring and control programme for IAQ. Consequently, there is no operational systematic indoor air monitoring programme in the EU. For most of the above pollutants, International Standards Organisation (ISO) specifications for indoor monitoring are available; there are also national standard monitoring methods (for example, in the United States of America) and standards issued by the European Committee for Standardization (CEN) (Table 4).

Selection of appropriate measurement technique

Proper source control and adequate ventilation are preferable means to prevent the accumulation of chemical pollutants in indoor spaces. Monitoring of chemical pollutants in schools and kindergartens should only be conducted under specific circumstances, such as special surveillance programmes aiming at characterizing a distribution of exposure levels and assessing compliance with guidelines or standards, or addressing complaints about IAQ (following inspections of indoor premises to identify and remove potential sources of pollution).

An appropriate measurement technique often depends on the purpose of measurements, e.g. testing for guideline compliance, addressing complaints, or assessing exposure to certain substances, and on the need for short-term or long-term measurements. For substances with acute health effects, short-term measurements are preferred. For substances with chronic effects (i.e. carcinogenic compounds) a monitoring program should aim at assessing long-term exposure. Ideally, multiple short-term measurements should be conducted in longitudinal survey settings in order to allow for the assessment of temporal changes in concentrations over time. However, in terms of cost–effectiveness and practical implementation this approach is rarely feasible. WHO IAQ

guideline values for selected priority indoor pollutants are listed in Table 5. It should be noted that "excess cancer risk" is defined by assuming that people are exposed continuously (24 hours per day) to the specific concentration of a pollutant during a lifetime. The WHO IAQ guidelines do not specify recommended limits for carcinogenic compounds which do not have thresholds for harmful effects. Instead, the guidelines include a unit risk for cancer effects, and propose examples of indoor concentrations corresponding to specific life-time excessive cancer risks. Member States or international organizations can set up their own limit values based on acceptable risk levels. An example of such limit value is the EU limit for indoor concentration of benzene, which is set at 5 μg/m^3 (EU, 2004a).

Table 4. Standards/methods for indoor air monitoring

Standard	Title	Applicable to the following main pollutants
ISO 16000-1	Indoor Air – Part 1: General Aspects of Sampling Strategy	All
ISO 16000-2	Indoor Air – Part 2: Sampling Strategy for Formaldehyde	Formaldehyde
ISO 16000-3	Indoor Air – Part 3: Determination of Formaldehyde and Other Carbonyl Compounds in indoor air and test chamber air – Active Sampling Method	Formaldehyde
ISO 16000-4	Indoor Air – Part 4: Determination of Formaldehyde – Diffusive Sampling Method	Formaldehyde
ISO 16000-5	Indoor Air – Part 5: Measurement Strategy for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	VOCs
ISO 16000-6	Indoor Air – Part 6: Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds in indoor and test chamber air by Active Sampling on Tenax TA Sorbent, Thermal Desorption and Gas Chromatography using MS/FID[a]	VOCs
ISO 16000-12	Indoor air – Part 12: Sampling strategy for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDDs), polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)	Benzo[α]pyrene
ISO 16000-13	Indoor air – Part 13: Determination of total (gas and particle-phase) polychlorinated dioxin-like biphenyls (PCBs) and polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins/dibenzofurans (PCDDs/PCDFs) – Collection on sorbent-backed filters	Benzo[α]pyrene
ISO 16000-14	Indoor air – Part 14: Determination of total (gas and particle-phase) polychlorinated dioxin-like biphenyls (PCBs) and polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins/dibenzofurans (PCDDs/PCDFs) – Extraction, clean-up and analysis by high-resolution gas chromatography and mass spectrometry	Benzo[α]pyrene
ISO 16000-15	Sampling strategy for nitrogen dioxide (NO_2)	NO_2
ISO 16017-1	Indoor, Ambient, and Workplace Air – Sampling and Analysis of Volatile Organic Compounds by Sorbent Tube/Thermal Desorption/capillary Gas Chromatograph – Part 1: Pumped Sampling	VOCs

Table 4 (concluded)

Standard	Title	Applicable to the following main pollutants
ISO 16017-2	Indoor, Ambient, and Workplace Air – Sampling and Analysis of Volatile Organic Compounds by Sorbent Tube/Thermal Desorption/capillary Gas Chromatograph – Part 2: Diffusive Sampling	VOCs
ISO 16200-2	Workplace air quality – Sampling and analysis of volatile organic compounds by solvent desorption/ gas chromatography. Part 2: Diffusive sampling method	VOCs
CEN EN[b] 14412	Indoor air quality – Diffusive samplers for the determination of concentrations of gases and vapours – Guide for selection, use and maintenance	
CEN EN 14662-5 (method for ambient air)	Ambient air quality – Standard method for measurement of benzene concentrations Part 5: Diffusive sampling followed by solvent desorption and gas chromatography	Benzene (and other VOCs)
United States EPA[c]. Method TO-13A (method for ambient air)	EPA (1999). Compendium method TO-13A. Determination of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in ambient air using gas chromatography/ mass spectrometry (GC/MS). EPA/625/R-96/010b.	Benzo[α]pyrene

[a] GC-MS/FID gas chromatography - mass spectrometer/flame ionization detector
[b] EN = Euro Norm
[c] EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency

Short-term (from less than one hour to a few hours) measurements are commonly conducted using an active sampling approach in which the air is drawn through the sorbent by a suction pump. Trapped substances are hereafter desorbed either chemically or thermally, and analysed using gas chromatography, high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) or other techniques. Compared to passive diffusion-based sampling, active sampling tends to be more expensive, more resource-intensive (as it requires a pump and specific skills from survey personnel), more difficult to use for the evaluation of individual exposure (i.e. personal exposure monitoring) and less suitable for monitoring air quality in classrooms due to noise produced by suction pumps. However, active sampling is generally more sensitive and accurate (Uhde, 2009), compared to passive sampling.

Long-term (several days) sampling is usually conducted using passive diffusion samplers, which rely on gaseous diffusion into a reactive adsorbent. As concentrations can only be measured over a relatively long time period, passive samplers are not useful for measuring peak concentrations. Compounds trapped in samplers are thermally or solvent desorbed, and analysed using gas chromatography, HPLC or other techniques. Unlike active (pumped) sampling, passive samplers require no electricity, have no moving parts, produce no noise, and are simple to use (no pump operation or calibration required).

Examples of causes of variations in air pollutant concentration over time include: changing ventilation during day/ night or weekdays/weekends, varying emission from products present in indoor environments and/or seasonal variations in ventilation, temperature and other conditions. The occurrence of short-term peak concentrations of compounds, which are emitted from building materials, such as VOCs, naphthalene or formaldehyde,

in classrooms is rather unlikely. However, short-term peaks of VOCs can occur due to the use of cleaning reagents and other chemicals indoor. In general, the use of passive diffusion samplers is appropriate for monitoring these pollutants. Compounds which are generated by combustion sources, such as gas or kerosene heaters, include benzene, carbon monoxide and NO_2. If combustion sources are present, concentrations of these pollutants can fluctuate widely during a short period of time. Cumulative exposure over a long period of time is important to assess for benzene, a known carcinogen while assessing peak levels is especially important for carbon monoxide which has acute health effects.

Seasonal variations in indoor pollutant concentration are caused by decreased ventilation rates in winter in naturally ventilated buildings or increased emission rates of formaldehyde in the summer due to increased temperature and relative humidity-related factors. Thus, for assessing average exposure levels in schools during the entire school year, it is advisable to conduct IAQ surveys during both the cold and warm periods. If the purpose of the survey is to assess high level exposures (worst case scenario), monitoring during the cold period is more suitable as concentrations of pollutants from indoor sources, especially combustion sources, tend to be higher in the winter.

The selection of sampling and data analysis methods is based on factors such as available resources, data requirements and time availability for the study. A comparison of information needs vs. costs is essential at the survey design phase for identifying appropriate sampling and data collection techniques, and the number of samples to be collected. An overview of IAQ monitoring projects carried out in Europe in the last 15 years (Table 6) shows that diffusive sampling has been selected in almost all surveys.

Selection of passive sampling devices

In passive diffusion samplers, the sorption rate (the amount of pollutant deposited

Table 5. Summary of WHO IAQ guideline limits for selected pollutants

Pollutant	Guideline limit	Excess cancer risk	Averaging time	Comment
Benzene	No safe level	$6x10^{-6}$ per µg m^{-3}	Lifetime	Carcinogen
Carbon monoxide	7 mg m^{-3}		24 h	
	10 mg m^{-3}		8 h	
	35 mg m^{-3}		60 min	
	100 mg m^{-3}		15 min	
Formaldehyde	100 µg m^{-3}		30 min	
Naphthalene	10 µg m^{-3}		1 year	
Nitrogen dioxide	40 µg m^{-3}		1 year	
	200 µg m^{-3}		1 hour	
PAH with Benzo[α] pyrene as marker	No safe level	$8.7x10^{-5}$ per ng m^{-3}	Lifetime	Carcinogen
Tetrachloroethylene	250 µg m^{-3}		1 year	
Trichloroethylene	No safe level	$4.3x10^{-7}$ per µg m^{-3}	Lifetime	Carcinogen

Source: WHO Regional Office for Europe (2010b)

Table 6. Selected projects involving monitoring of priority pollutants in indoor air.

Project title	Information sources	Coordinator(s)	Time period	Measurement location
Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)	ALSPAC (2015)	Building Research Establishment (BRE), United Kingdom	1991–1992	Avon area (West England)
AIRMEX	Geiss et al. (2011), Kotzias et al. (2009), Bruinen de Bruin et al. (2008)	JRC IHCP[a]	2003–2008	11 cities in EU
Prioritization of BUilding MAterials Emissions as indoor pollution sources (BUMA)	Missia et al. (2010), Bartzis et al. (2008), BUMA (2006)		2006–2009	5 cities in EU
EXPOLIS	Jantunen et al. (1998), Jurvelin et al. (2000, 2001), Lai et al. (2007), Rotko et al. (2000), Edwards et al. (2001), Hanninen et al. (2004), Expolis (2007)	National Public Health Institute of Finland (KTL) Finland	1996–1997	6 cities in EU
Flanders Indoor Exposure Survey (FLIES)	FLIES (2012)	Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium	2006	East Flanders
German Environmental Survey for Children (GerES IV)	Becker et al. (2008)	Federal Environment Agency (UBA) Germany	2003–2005	All over Germany
Health Effects of School Environment (HESE)	HESE (2015)	University of Siena, Italy	2004–2005	6 cities in EU
Indoor air quality in homes in England in England	Coward et al. (2001)	BRE, United Kingdom	1997–1999	All over England
Monitoring of Atmospheric Concentration of Benzene in European Towns and Homes project (MACBETH)	Cocheo et al. (2000)	JRC IES[b]; Fondazione Maugeri	1996–1998	5 cities in EU
On the reduction of health effects from combined exposure to indoor air pollutants in modern offices project (OFFICAIR)	Bluyssen et al. (2012); OFFICAIR (2013	University of Western Macedonia	2010–2013	8 cities in EU
l'Observatoire de la qualité de l'air intérieur (OQAI) French 1st plan	OQAI (2014)	IAQ Observatory	2003–2005	All over France
Population Exposure to Air Pollutants in Europe (PEOPLE)	Field et al. (2005), Ballesta et al. (2006); Project PEOPLE (2005)	JRC IES	2002–2003	Selected cities in EU

Compounds	Sampling technique	Measurement duration	Measurement frequency	Sampling location
VOCs, NO_2, HCHO	Diffusive	3 days – 4 weeks	12 times per year	Private houses
VOCs, aldehydes	Diffusive	Fixed: 7 days Personal: 3 days	2 times per year (summer/winter)	Offices, schools, private houses, personal
VOCs, aldehydes	Diffusive	Fixed: 7 days Personal: 3 days	2 times per year (summer/winter)	Public offices
VOCs, CO/NOx, $PM_{2.5}$	Active	Personal: 2 days	1 time	Private houses, workplaces, personal
VOCs, NO_2, aldehydes, PM	Diffusive	7 days	1 time	Private houses
VOCs, aldehydes	Diffusive	7 days	1 time	Private houses
VOCs, O_3, NOx	Diffusive	7 days	1 time	Schools
VOCs, aldehydes, NO_2, CO	Diffusive	3 days – 4 weeks	1 time	Private houses
Benzene	Diffusive	5 days	6 times per year	Private houses, personal
Health relevant pollutants (including VOCs, aldehydes)	Diffusive and active	5 days	2 times	Modern office buildings
VOCs, aldehydes				Private houses
Benzene	Diffusive	Fixed: 24 hours Personal: 12 hours	1 time	Private houses, shops, schools, restaurants

Table 6 (concluded)

Project title	Information sources	Coordinator(s)	Time period	Measurement location
SEARCH	Csobod et al. (2010)	Regional Environmental Center (REC)	2006–2009 and 2010–2013	100 schools in selected cities in 10 countries
SINPHONIE	Csobod et al. (2014)	REC, IDMEC-FEUP[c], JRC-IHCP, NIEH[d]	2010–2012	114 schools in 23 countries in Europe
French pilot IAQ monitoring project	Michelot et al. (2013)	IAQ Observatory	2009–2011	310 schools and day care centres in France (pilot project)
WHO Schools Survey	WHO Regional Office for Europe (2011)	WHO	2011–2013	Volunteering countries in WHO European Region

CO = Carbon monoxide
HCHO = formaldehyde
NOx = mono-nitrogen oxides (e.g. NO [nitric oxide] and NO_2 [nitrogen dioxide])
O_3 = trioxygen (also known as ozone)
[a] JRC IHCP = Joint Research Centre Institute for Health and Consumer Protection
[b] JRC IES = Joint Research Centre Institute for Envirnment and Sustainability
[c] IDMEC-FEUP = Institute of Mechanical Engineering – Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto (Portugal)
[d] National Institute of Environmental Health, Hungary

Compounds	Sampling technique	Measurement duration	Measurement frequency	Sampling location
VOCs, formaldehyde, NO_2, PM_{10}, CO_2	Diffusive (except PM_{10} and CO_2)	5 days	1 time	Schools
VOCs, HCHO, CO, CO_2, NO_2, ozone, PM, naphthalene	Diffusive (except CO, CO_2, PM)	5 days	1–2 times	Schools
Benzene, formaldehyde, CO_2	Diffusive (except CO_2)	5 days	2 times (cold and warm seasons)	Schools
Benzene, formaldehyde, CO, CO_2, NO_2	Diffusive (except CO, CO_2)	5 days	1 time	Schools

© Christian Gapp

on the cartridge in a given period of time) depends on the diffusion coefficient of a specific analyte, and ratio of the diffusive surface area and the distance between the diffusive and absorbing surface. In general, diffusion samplers with a higher sorption rate require a shorter sampling period to quantify a specific level of pollutant.

Many models of passive diffusion samplers are available commercially. Many of them are designed for monitoring exposures in occupational settings where levels of pollutants tend to be relatively high. In school settings, concentrations of pollutants tend to be lower. At the same time, it is desirable to complete sampling within one school week. Therefore, it is important to select samplers with high sorption rates to be able to quantify relatively low levels of pollutants (below the WHO guidelines) during this time interval.

The choice of appropriate diffusive sampling devices should be based on the following criteria:

a. high sorption rate; using devices with an insufficient sorption rate may lead to an insufficient amount of pollutant in the cartridge and the inability to quantify its air concentration;

b. samplers referenced in ISO or other equivalent norms;

c. user friendliness;

d. sufficiently validated samplers with a history of successful applications in previous similar projects; and

e. availability of external analytical service; some manufacturers offer an analytical service for the diffusive samplers they sell. This allows for samplers to be sent to an external laboratory in case analytical capabilities are not available at the research centre.

Quality assurance / quality control

Comparability of results can only be ensured if the analytical skills of laboratory staff have been confirmed through inter-laboratory comparison or other external quality control methods. An ideal way to ensure the consistency of results is to analyse all samples in one accredited reference laboratory. However, this is frequently not feasible, due to high transportation costs. It is also desirable to ensure that countries have access to domestic laboratories. Laboratory proficiency testing is useful in identifying laboratories where staff needs to have additional training prior to being included in research projects.

Sampling location

Comparability of measurement results also depends on using consistent rules for selecting appropriate sampling locations. In accordance with ISO 16000-1 the following rules should be followed:

a. the centre of a room is generally considered as the most suitable location for sampling;

b. in case sampling in the centre of the room is not possible, samplers should not be installed closer than 1 m from the wall;

c. the sampling height should be about 1.0 – 1.5 m from the floor; and

d. locations exposed to direct sunshine, near heating sources, or near ventilation channels should be avoided.

At each school, it is recommended to have at least one outdoor sampling site, where monitoring is conducted concurrently with indoor monitoring. Outdoor samplers are placed in special shelters to prevent exposure to sunlight and rain. Comparison of indoor and outdoor concentrations helps to find out if pollution originates mainly from indoor sources.

Examples of standard sampling and analysis methods applicable to IAQ monitoring in schools

Benzene (Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) 71-43-2), trichloroethylene (CAS 79-01-6) and tetrachloroethylene (CAS

127-18-4). Reference methods: ISO 16000-5, CEN EN14662-5, ISO 16200-2. Long-term monitoring is in this case the preferred method. Passive samplers are exposed to the air for several days. Benzene and other volatile organic compounds are trapped in an activated charcoal based sorbent. After the sampling procedure, these compounds are recovered with carbon disulphide, and the solution is analysed using a gas chromatograph coupled to a mass selective or a flame ionisation detector.

Formaldehyde (CAS 50-00-0). Reference method: ISO 16000-4. Formaldehyde (HCHO) has a 30-minute-averaged guideline value which formally requires short-term sampling. However, the likelihood of strong short-term fluctuations in formaldehyde concentration in classrooms is rather low. Thus, the use of passive samplers is an appropriate, affordable option. Passive samplers are exposed to air for several days. Formaldehyde is trapped in a 2,4-dinitrophenylhydrazine based sorbent. After the sampling procedure, formaldehyde is recovered using acetonitrile, and the solution is analysed using a HPLC system coupled to an ultraviolet/visible or diode-array detector.

Nitrogen Dioxide (CAS 10102-44-0). Reference method: ISO 16000-15. Passive samplers are exposed to air for several days. NO_2 is trapped as nitrite ion in a triethanol amine based sorbent. The nitrite ion is extracted using water and analysed by spectrophotometry (or ion chromatography) after the extract, having been treated with Griess reagent, sulphanilamide and α-naphthylamine, displays a red/pink colour.

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) including benzo[α]pyrene (CAS 50-32-8) and naphthalene (CAS 91-20-3). Reference methods: ISO 16000-12/13/14, United States EPA TO-13A and method developed by Wauters et al. (2008). The sampling of semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOC), which are partly adsorbed on particles, is typically conducted using high-volume active samplers. The method described by Wauters et al. (2008) is based on 24-hour active sampling on sorption tubes consisting of polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) foam, PDMS particles and a TENAX TA bed. After sampling, the solutes (e.g. benzo[α] pyrene) are quantitatively recovered by thermal desorption and analysed by capillary GC-MS. In the United States EPA method, TO-13A, approximately 300 m^3 of air is sampled through filters and sorbent cartridges (containing polyurethane foam [PUF] or XAD-2®). The filters and sorbent cartridges are extracted using a Soxhlet extractor and the concentrated extract is analysed using GC-MS. The ISO methods 16000-12/13/14 involve pulling a sample of air through a fine particle filter that contains a vapour trap consisting of polyurethane foam. Filter and PUF extracts are analysed by GC-MS.

Carbon Monoxide (CAS 630-08-0). Reference methods: ISO 4224:2000. Measuring short-term peak levels of carbon monoxide is important in the presence of indoor combustion sources. A variety of monitoring devices using infrared radiation adsorption and electrochemical sensors can be used for real-time carbon monoxide monitoring. Some commercially available monitoring devices for CO_2 also have sensors for carbon monoxide enabling real-time monitoring of both pollutants and storage of data in device memory.

3.1.2 Monitoring exposure to mould and dampness

Overview of health effects and risk factors for exposure

Microbial pollution is a key element of indoor air pollution. It is composed of hundreds of species of bacteria and fungi, in particular filamentous fungi (mould), some of which proliferate indoors when sufficient moisture is available. The links between dampness and mould exposure and adverse respiratory health effects are well established (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2009; Mendell et al., 2011; Tischer et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2013; Kanchongkittiphon et al., 2015). Generally, the presence of dampness and visible mould indicates excessive microbial

proliferation, which is problematic because it may lead to increased exposure to airborne biological contaminants that can cause adverse health outcomes (e.g. respiratory diseases, allergic reactions) in building occupants (Fisk et al., 2007).

The *WHO Guidelines for Indoor Air Quality – Dampness and Mould* (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2009) are formulated on the basis of a comprehensive review demonstrating that exposure to indoor dampness is very common. The review concludes that the most important effects of exposure to dampness and mould are increased prevalence of respiratory symptoms, allergies and asthma, as well as perturbation of the immunological system. In addition to residential buildings, dampness and mould problems occur in school buildings, day-care centres, and other buildings. The Guidelines describe agents that may be associated with adverse health effects: bacterial and fungal spores and cell fragments or components, such as endotoxin and β-glucans, microbial volatile organic compounds (MVOCs) and mycotoxins.

Exposure to visible mould, dampness or mould odour is associated with elevated risks of respiratory symptoms or diseases, such as upper respiratory track symptoms, cough, wheeze, and asthma. Results of meta-analysis of published epidemiological study results, the central estimates of the odds ratio range from 1.34 for asthma development to 1.75 for cough in children, with most estimates being statistically significant (i.e. lower confidence limit for odds ratio exceeding 1) (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2009a). As the relationships between dampness, microbial exposure and health effects cannot yet be quantified precisely, no numerical, health-based guideline values or thresholds can be recommended. Instead, it is recommended that dampness and mould-related problems be prevented (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2009a). When problems do occur, they should be remediated because they increase the risk of hazardous exposure to microbes and chemicals.

Observation of moisture damage and/or visible mould in school buildings has been linked to increased levels of a variety of microbial agents, including viable spores, fungal DNA, mycotoxins, and various markers for microbial exposure, such as ergosterol, 3-hydroxy fatty acids and muramic acid in indoor air (Meklin et al., 2002; Hyvärinen et al., 2003; Lignell et al., 2007; Cai et al., 2009; Peitzsch et al., 2012; Thomas et al., 2012; Jacobs et al., 2013, 2014). The available evidence does not suggest that any measurement of microbial materials is demonstrably more specific or sensitive in terms of measuring health-related exposure.

Factors promoting mould growth and measures aiming at exposure prevention

The term “mould growth” refers to microbial growth in general. Factors contributing to mould growth and dampness in school buildings are not very different from those associated with residential or other indoor environments. The definition of “dampness” from the WHO guidelines (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2009) is the following:

> *any visible, measurable or perceived outcome of excess moisture that causes problems in buildings, such as mould, leaks or material degradation, mould odour or directly measured excess moisture (in terms of relative humidity or moisture content) or microbial growth.*

The key factor in preventing mould growth is moisture control, since microbial life is water-dependent. Causes of excess moisture in indoor environments include high air humidity, condensation on surfaces and presence of water due to flooding or leakages (Warscheid, 2011). In addition to external sources of water (e.g. rain, ground moisture/water, melting snow) and water supply, sewage, heating or cooling systems, other sources of water include cooking and cleaning, as well as moisture emissions by building occupants. It has been demonstrated that remediation of dampness problems can reduce adverse health outcomes. The primary means for avoiding adverse health effects is prevention (or minimization) of dampness and microbial growth on interior surfaces

and in building structures.

The school environment may contribute considerably to the total daily exposure of children to microbial agents and allergens, as exposure levels in schools may be higher than in homes (Jacobs et al., 2013; Krop et al., 2014). High classroom occupancy density has been associated with increased levels of exposure to indoor microbial agents and allergens (Jacobs et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2000). There are large differences in indoor microbial levels between different countries and climatic regions, as well as between school buildings within the same country (Wady et al., 2004; Simoni et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2014). Indoor allergens, such as dander from cats and dogs, excrement and residues from dust mites, cockroaches and rodents, and fungal allergens, are also commonly found in school buildings, especially in low-income neighbourhoods and rural areas, although assessing a relative importance of allergen exposure in schools for public health requires further investigations (Salo et al., 2009).

The type of ventilation system and season affect indoor microbial levels in schools (Liu et al., 2000; Wady et al., 2004; Meyer et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2013, 2014). Successful moisture control usually requires a sufficient flow of outdoor air for ventilation: to remove indoor-generated pollutants and moisture from indoor air and/or to dilute their concentrations to acceptable levels; and to maintain building integrity.

Proposed data collection via inspections

In lieu of reliable and accurate methods to measure exposure to biological indoor air pollutants directly, many surveys have used observations of dampness and mould as an exposure indicator. Observational data have usually been collected from building owners and occupants using questionnaires, or via conducting on-site building inspections. The Health Effects of Indoor Pollutants: Integrating microbial, toxicological and epidemiological approaches (HITEA) study involved both questionnaires and inspections, and it compared these two methods for validation purposes (Haverinen-Shaughnessy et al., 2012a). It was recommended that questionnaire based results should always be validated using on-site inspections by trained staff.

A typical school inspection protocol includes the following.

1. Collecting background information about the school building: occupancy, year of construction, type of structure, history of water damage, dampness and mould, IAQ complaints, related investigations and remediation actions.

2. Inspecting the school building: a walk-through utilizing standard checklists and applicable tools (e.g. surface moisture detectors, also known as moisture meters, which measure the moisture content of building materials such as carpet, wood, brick, concrete). During inspection, signs of dampness and mould problems (on walls, floors, ceilings, windows and ventilation, plumbing, and sewage systems) are assessed. Examples of signs include: water leaks, condensation on surfaces, detached covering and finishing materials, blistered paint, discoloured materials, and visible mould growth.

Whereas building inspections in large scale surveys have been limited to the use of non-destructive methods, it should be noted that in many case studies and smaller scale surveys designed to solve indoor environmental quality [IEQ] problems related to dampness and mould, it is often necessary to include destructive methods in building inspections. This is because opening building structures provides more in-depth information about the sources and extent of dampness and mould problems; microbial determination from building materials often provides valuable data.

Adequate training of building inspectors is essential for ensuring the comparability of inspection data produced by different individuals.

3.1.3 Monitoring CO_2 levels and ventilation rate

Ventilation introduces fresh air and removes pollutant emissions from occupants, furniture, materials, appliances and activities (e.g. using chemical cleaners). Building occupants always generate bio effluent emissions, such as CO_2, moisture, VOCs and particles from skin, hair and clothing. VOCs, such as formaldehyde, are also commonly emitted from building materials. Combustion-based indoor heaters emit nitrogen dioxides, carbon monoxide, benzene and other pollutants.

One of the most critical functions of ventilation is to remove moisture from the building. Moisture is emitted by occupants, generated through their activities (e.g. cooking, showering, cleaning), and produced via chronic leaks from the piping, roofs or through basement walls. If this moisture is not sufficiently transported away, it may lead to the growth of moulds and bacteria.

Insufficient ventilation may also lead to complaints from building occupants about "air stuffiness". This is problematic because air stuffiness is associated with increased infection risk due accumulation of viruses and pathogenic bacteria emitted by infected individuals, including those without any symptoms of illness. These exposures to physical, chemical and biological factors may be associated with school absenteeism and reduced learning and academic performance.

The key parameter which is used for assessing air stuffiness in indoor spaces is the concentration of CO_2, a gaseous compound exhaled by humans. Perhaps the oldest known recommendation on IAQ and CO_2 level is the one developed by Max von Pettenkofer in 1858 (Pettenkofer, 1858). He recommended a maximum level of 1000 ppm for indoor spaces, which is currently also the recommended maximum level in classrooms in Germany (UBA, 2008).

Besides overt health effects caused by exposures to pollutants and biological organisms and toxins, elevated levels of CO_2 may also directly affect the emotional/mental well-being and cognitive performance of pupils. The performance on tasks, which require concentration and are mentally demanding, has been shown to decline when CO_2 level increases. A recent double-blinded experimental-controlled study demonstrated that even moderately elevated CO_2 levels, which are very common in classrooms, can adversely affect cognitive performance (Satish et al., 2012). Furthermore, a controlled classroom study found that pupils performed faster and more accurately on four different performance tests when they were in rooms with higher ventilation rates (Bako-Biro et al., 2012). Similar associations between the academic performance of elementary school students and ventilation were observed in non-controlled settings (Haverinen-Shaughnessy, Moschandreas & Shaughnessy, 2011; Haverinen-Shaughnessy et al., 2012c).

For the purpose of school surveys, CO_2 logging devices which store a continuous time series of sampled values are preferable. Modern devices can store tens of thousands of values, allowing monitoring during an entire school week. At least one week of monitoring is recommended to accurately capture the day-to-day variability in the conditions due to changes in weather, occupant behaviour and other factors.

The most reliable portable CO_2 monitoring method is based on non-dispersive infrared (NDIR) sensor technology. Handheld devices can operate on battery power for one to two days, but require external power to operate for a school week. CO_2 monitors are prone to calibration errors and, therefore, require comprehensive QA/QC procedures. Some models of CO_2 monitors have integrated temperature and relative humidity sensors so that all these parameters can be monitored simultaneously with the same device.

CO_2 time-series data can be used to estimate air exchange rates (typically expressed as air exchanges per hour, [hr^{-1}]) in classrooms and, in combination with classroom occupancy data, ventilation

rates, which are typically expressed as litre per second per person (lps pp) (Hänninen, 2013).

3.1.4 Monitoring other physical factors (temperature, relative humidity, reverberation time, noise and lighting)

Temperature and relative humidity are important physical factors affecting the sense of well-being. Too low or too high indoor air temperature is associated with performance decrements (Lan et al., 2011). The optimal temperature range depends on the country and season, which may also influence the individuals' choice of clothing. In winter conditions, temperatures below 19° C have been associated with more than a measurable decrease in academic performance (Berglund, Gonzales & Gagge, 1990). Many countries have requirements for thermal comfort in classrooms that specify minimum and, sometimes, maximum, allowable temperatures (see the WHO Policy Questionnaire, IAQ section, more detailed data). In Germany, the classroom temperature is required to be between 20°C and 26°C (UBA, 2008).

Controlling relative humidity is important for children's comfort and for the prevention of moisture accumulation, which can lead to mold growth. In general, relative humidity shall be between 30% and 50%. Relative humidity and temperature can be monitored using a single, small-sized device that can run for as long as one year with a single set of batteries.

The reverberation time in the classroom affects speech understandability and the level of noise, as a function of the Lombard effect; this phenomenon is illustrated in Fig. 2. The reverberation time can be understood as the acoustic card of a given room. It depends on the presence of sufficient sound-absorbing surfaces in the room. Classrooms need to have a short reverberation time so that speech can be understood more clearly. Appropriate reverberation time for classrooms is 0.5 s ± 20% (DIN, 2004). Increased reverberation time results in higher noise levels which can impair speech understandability, adversely affect learning process and induce mood disorders (Schönwälder et al., 2004).

In Germany, exposure to noise in schools, is regulated using lower and upper action levels, which are based on measurements of eight hours average noise level in decibel units using decibel A filters (dB(A)), which reflects the frequency sensitivity of the human ear. The lower action level is 80 dB(A) (recommended measures to reduce exposure), the upper action level of 85 dB(A) triggers mandatory actions to reduce exposure to noise, as specified in the Occupational Safety and Health Regulation (Bundesregierung, 2010).

Bad lighting can cause early fatigue and lead to impaired concentration, adversely affecting the learning process and well-being. In Germany, lighting in classrooms should be at least 300 lux (DIN, 2011).

Table 7 summarizes the most important physical factors affecting the quality of the school environment with German limit values provided as an example of existing national regulations.

3.2 Examples of recent and ongoing exposure assessment surveys in the WHO European Region

The list of surveys summarized in this report and their parameters are presented in Table 8.

3.2.1 SEARCH project

The SEARCH (School Environment And Respiratory health of CHildren) project was a research initiative supported by the Italian Ministry for the Environment, Land and Sea (IMELS) and implemented within the international frameworks of the EU Action Plan on Environment and Health and the WHO Children's Environment and

Fig. 2. The effect of reverberation on noise and speech understandability – the Lombard effect



Source: Lombard (1911).

Table 7. Indoor environment in schools: physical factors, measurement methods and reference values

Physical factor	Measurement method	Reference value in Germany
Air exchange rate (ventilation)	CO_2 analyser	1 000 ppm
Room air temperature	Thermo hygrometer	20–26°C
Relative humidity	Thermo hygrometer	30–50%
Reverberation time	Analyser for reverberation time	0.5 s ± 20%
Lighting	Lux meter	300 lux

Health Action Plan for Europe (CEHAPE) (Csobod et al., 2010).

The first phase of the SEARCH initiative was the SEARCH-I project (2006–2009) in six countries. The SEARCH-II project (2010–2013) geographically expanded the SEARCH initiative to four additional countries in eastern Europe, Caucasus and central Asia (EECCA) region and extended its scope. Data from the two phases have been pooled and the results are based on the analysis of all data from all ten participating countries (Albania, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Serbia, Slovakia, Tajikistan and Ukraine).

Table 8. Summary of exposure assessment surveys in schools presented in the report

Survey name	Years	Number of Member States involved	Parameters monitored
SEARCH	2006–2009	10	PM_{10}, formaldehyde, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylenes, NO_2, CO_2, temperature, energy consumption, respiratory symptoms
SINPHONIE	2010–2012	23	Formaldehyde, benzene, other VOCs, PAHs, CO, CO_2, radon, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, allergens in dust, mould, bacteria in dust and air, temperature, respiratory symptoms
HITEA	2008–2010	3	Mould, allergens, CO_2, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2
National IAQ monitoring programme in France	ongoing	1	Formaldehyde, benzene, CO_2 in all French schools, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2, VOCs, metals, allergens, acoustic properties, lighting in a sample of schools.
Municipal-level surveys in Germany; survey in Cologne as an example	ongoing	1	Formaldehyde, other aldehydes, VOCs, PCBs, lighting, acoustic properties, noise, mould, hygiene and sanitation, asbestos, etc. The verification code for this document is 395497
WHO Schools Survey	2012–ongoing	5 included in the report	Formaldehyde, benzene, NO_2, CO_2 and ventilation rate, CO, temperature, relative humidity, mould, smoking in school, mode of transportation to school, sanitation and hygiene
UNICEF survey in Georgia	2013	1	Sanitation and hygiene

CO = carbon monoxide

Ten schools and three to four classrooms per school (with about 100 children in each school) were selected in each country. In total, 7860 children from 388 classrooms in 100 schools in 10 countries participated in the project. Levels of selected pollutants were measured inside and outside of schools during the heating season: formaldehyde, VOCs (benzene, toluene, ethyl-benzene and xylenes), carbon monoxide, NO_2, PM_{10}, and CO_2. Temperature (T) and relative humidity (RH), were monitored inside each classroom.

Average levels of indoor air pollutants in classrooms in the ten participating countries are presented in Table 9. The range of country-level mean concentrations for PM_{10} was from 28 to 102 µg/m^3 with highest levels measured in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Tajikistan. These levels are substantially higher than the WHO ambient air quality guidelines for PM_{10} of 20 µg/m^3 (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2006). Average levels in schools in some countries also exceeded the WHO Interim Target 1 of 70 µg/m^3 specified in the Guidelines. Similarly, Tajikistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina had the highest levels of benzene exceeding the EU limit for indoor spaces of 5 µg/m^3.