



## Appendix I:

### Section 4: Methodology for case studies

The case study examples that are included in this document are considered a ‘first round’. We set out to provide case studies to illustrate implementation examples of good practice and a more detailed analysis of lessons learned to assist those considering implementing the strategy in their own setting. However the reality is that many programmes have not been examined with respect to their effectiveness and it is even less likely that they will have been evaluated using a rigorous research design that includes a comparison group and a look at behavioural and injury outcomes. As a result many programmes could not be included as case studies in this version, but it is anticipated that as more programmes receive adequate evaluation additional examples can be added.

Case studies were sought and selected based on the following criteria:

- Example programme addresses issues of priority within Europe (based on injury burden).
- Example programme met our definition of good practice.
- Example programme corresponds with one of the good practices identified.

- Example programme has been implemented and evaluated (both process and outcome evaluations completed) in a European setting and found to be effective.

In addition to the selection criteria, where possible we also attempted to select case study examples that reflected a range of resource intensities (e.g., a range of costs to implement) and implementation levels (e.g., national, regional or local). Case studies were also selected to try and reflect the efforts from as many areas of Europe as possible. Case study examples were sought in a snowball approach through various sources including members of the European Child Safety Alliance and other child injury prevention and safety promotion experts. In addition, internet searches and selective reviews of the recent literature were used to identify additional potential case studies.

For each potential case study selected, a contact person was identified and a research associate contacted him or her to ascertain that the potential case study met the inclusion criteria. Once this was established, available documentation was examined and a standardised interview was conducted that sought and summarised the following information:

- Implementation level (at what level was the strategy focussed – national, regional or local?)

- Strategy approach (which of the 3 E’s was used – education, engineering, enforcement or a combination?)
- Setting of intervention (where did the intervention take place?)
- Target audience for the intervention (at who was the intervention aimed?)
- Resource intensity – an indication of the resource intensity required [€ = up to €20.000/year, €€ = €20-90.000/year, €€€ = €100-299.000/year, €€€€ = €300-999.000/year, €€€€€ = €1.000.000 plus/year]\*
- Background for the initiative (including rationale, driving force, timeframe and major partners)
- Aim & objectives of intervention
- Key steps / actions in intervention
- Evaluation of intervention
- Lessons learned (including barriers and facilitators, advice to countries and issues around transferability)

\*The resource implications provided should be interpreted carefully. First they do not include in-kind support which in many cases far outweighs the actual budget spent on the implementation of a strategy. Second although the resource intensity estimates provided come from the project personnel themselves, it is important to remember that costs vary by country for many things such as people’s time, printing of resources, etc. As a result the resources required when looking at transferring a strategy from one setting to another may vary from what is reported here.





- References
- Contact information for intervention

Following each interview, the case study was written up in a consistent format, which included the addition of the evidence statement supporting the strategy. Case studies were then returned to the contact for confirmation and clarification before being added to the guide. Of note, three of the cases studies - Safe Road to School in Faro, Portugal; Bicycle Helmet Campaign, Denmark and Child Resistant Packaging for Chemicals, Netherlands - are enhanced expansions of case studies originally collected for the WHO for the Children's health and environment case studies summary book<sup>93</sup>

Finally it is important to note that the cases studies included in the following section are an initial attempt to illustrate examples of existing good practice. The European Child Safety Alliance invites submission of additional case study ideas that meet the criteria described above for inclusion in future editions. Please forward case study ideas to [secretariat@childsafetyeurope.org](mailto:secretariat@childsafetyeurope.org)



# Pool Safety France

<b>IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL</b>	National
<b>APPROACH</b>	Enforcement
<b>SETTING</b>	Pools
<b>TARGET AUDIENCE</b>	Pool owners, children under 5 years
<b>RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS</b>	€€€
<b>EVIDENCE BASE:</b>	Legislation requiring isolation fencing with secure, self-latching gates for all pools, public, semi-public and private, including both newly constructed and existing pools, leads to a reduction in drowning when enforcement provisions are included. <sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

## Background

A law was introduced in January 2003 aimed at reducing pool drowning among children. The legislation states that in-ground pools on holiday rental property must have a safety system installed by May 2004. All other private pools have until January 2006 to comply with legislation, except new pools, which must include safety systems before building is authorised. The law does not apply to above ground or indoor pools.

Safety systems can consist of either:

- a fence that is at least 1.10 metres high with a child-proof opening and closing system;
- a reinforced pool cover that must have supporting bars along the sides, strong enough to hold the weight of a child;
- a shelter that covers the pool and can resist snow and wind;
- an alarm set to go off when an object weighing more than 5 kg goes into the water.

All pool owners must ensure that installation of security devices come with a certificate of compliance. Pool owners who do not comply with legislation could face a €45,000 fine and criminal charges of death by negligence if a child drowns in their pool.

## Policy Background/Driving Force

France has the largest private swimming pool market in Europe, with over one million pools. It also has the highest rates of infant death by drowning in pools in the world. Approximately 15 to 20 children aged 5 years and under drown in pools every year.

### Partners

- Consumer Safety Commission (CSC)
- Former Senator Jean-Pierre Raffarin
- Direction générale de l'urbanisme, de l'habitat et de la construction
- Direction générale de la concurrence, de la consommation et de la répression des fraudes (DGCCRF)

### Aims & Objectives

To reduce the incidence of drowning among children 5 years and younger.

### Evaluation

Evaluation of the effectiveness of the legislation is difficult at this early stage, particularly since it is not yet mandatory for all indoors pools. Nevertheless, an evaluation is expected, and the

law requires that the government present a report to parliament before January 2007.

It is known that childhood deaths due to drowning have so far decreased from 25 in 2003 to 17 in 2004.

### Key Steps

The Consumer Safety Commission issued a recommendation in October 1999 asking for a law making safety protection for indoor pools mandatory. This recommendation received strong support from Senator (and subsequent Prime Minister) Jean-Pierre Raffarin. The legislation was passed in the senate and parliament without opposition.

### Lessons Learned

#### Barriers

- Pool professionals were not in favour of the law because they thought it would have a negative impact on the number of pools constructed. This did not occur – the number of pools built is still increasing.

#### Facilitators

- Several associations, including “Sauve qui Veut” (a drowning prevention and victim’s aid association), were active in lobbying.
- Senator Raffarin lobbied strongly for legislation.



- All consumer groups agreed on the importance of the law.
- Tourism boards will not rent properties with improperly protected pools. Some public authorities, including DGCCRF, regulate these groups and ensure they comply with legislation.
- The four different protection system options mean that pool owners have a choice regarding costs associated with complying with the legislation.\*

### Advice to Countries/Transferability

- Legislation of mandatory pool fencing in Australia met fierce opposition from pool owners, who framed the debate as intrusion into private space.<sup>4</sup>
- The French legislation is different from that seen in Australia, New Zealand or Canada, because pool owners can choose between four different types of protection systems.
- It is recommended that parents be strongly encouraged to continue close supervision of their children around pools: no protection system can replace parental supervision.

### References, Additional Information

1. Harborview Injury Prevention and Research Center. (2001). Best practices. Seattle: University of Washington. Available at <http://depts.washington.edu/hiprc/practices/index.html>
2. Thompson, D. C., & Rivara, R. P. (2005). Pool fencing for preventing drowning in children. The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Issue 3.
3. World Health Organization. Guidelines for safe recreational water environments. Volume 2: Swimming pools, spas, and similar recreational-water environments. Geneva: WHO. Available at [http://www.who.int/water\\_sanitation\\_health/bathing/bathing2/en/](http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/bathing/bathing2/en/)

4. Carey, V., Chapman, S., & Gaffney, D. (1994). Children's lives or garden aesthetics? A case study in public health advocacy. *Australian Journal of Public Health*, 18(1), 25-32.

See also:

<http://riviera.angloinfo.com/information/1/poollaw.asp> (in English)

<http://www.logement.equipement.gouv.fr/actu/piscinespriv/default.htm> (in French)

<http://www.sauvequiveut.asso.fr/> (in French)

### Contact

Name: Florence Weill  
 Address: Commission de la Sécurité des Consommateurs  
 Cité Martignac - 111 rue de Grenelle  
 75353 Paris 07 SP  
 France  
 Tel: +33 (0)1 43 19 56 53  
 E-mail: [florence.weill@csc.finances.gouv.fr](mailto:florence.weill@csc.finances.gouv.fr)



<sup>1</sup> Fences cost approximately €5,000 for a pool of 12 m x 8 m with a gate. An alarm set costs around €700. A pool cover costs between €56/m<sup>2</sup> – €64/m<sup>2</sup>, so an automatic cover can cost €6,500. Shelters are the most expensive option at between €12,000 – €18,000 euros, depending on pool dimensions.