

**ANNEX I:
EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET**

PROJECT	
Participant:	101252945 – Uit de Marge vzw - UdM
PIC number:	892268469
Project name and acronym:	CERV-2025-CITIZENS-CIV - COSY

EVENT DESCRIPTION	
Event number:	WP14
Event name:	Local community safety signals of outreach youth workers connected to the municipality of Lanaken
Type:	Training
In situ/online:	In situ
Location:	Belgium 1. Vrijzinning Punt, Albrecht Rodenbachstraat 18, 3500 Hasselt 2. Vrijzinning Punt, Albrecht Rodenbachstraat 18, 3500 Hasselt 3. Vrijzinning Punt, Albrecht Rodenbachstraat 18, 3500 Hasselt
Date(s):	1. 13/07/2026 2. 29/07/2026 3. 10/08/2026
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.uitdemarge.be/cosy/
Participants	
Female:	1. 1 2. 1 3. 4
Male:	1. 6 2. 0 3. 0
Non-binary:	1. 1 2. 0 3. 0
From country 1 [name]:	Belgium
...	
Total number of participants:	13

Description

Provide a short description of the event and its activities.

1. Introduction and objective of this report

This report accounts for the implementation of Work Package 14 (WP14) of the COSY project — "Local community safety signals of outreach youth workers connected to the municipality of Lanaken" — in fulfilment of specific objective SO1 ("Gaining insight into local community safety signals behind the societal safety symptoms") and, more specifically, operational objective OO1.2 ("Discovering and determining local community safety signals from and with youth workers").

WP14 turns to outreach youth workers and youth development workers rather than young people directly, using the same Flip-thinking training format that combines professional development with integrated signal capture. Three activities were organized on this basis, all held in Hasselt for the same practical reasons of accessibility documented for WP13.

Important note on completeness: despite active outreach, WP14 did not reach the minimum target of 25 unique participants set for this work package. In total, 13 youth workers took part in the three activities reported below. Section 3.1 sets out the reasons for this shortfall and the mitigating actions taken. This work package is therefore submitted as incomplete relative to its original target, while still providing the fullest possible account of the signals captured to date.

This report:

- presents the process toolkit that was used, across the whole COSY project, to determine what qualifies as a local community safety signal;
- describes the youth work landscape of Lanaken and the Flip-thinking training methodology used to reach youth workers;
- transparently documents the participation shortfall against the 25-participant target and the reasons for it;
- documents the three activities organized for WP14 (context, approach, participants), each separately numbered on the same template;
- presents, for each activity, the signals identified — including, where available, their formal assessment against the Safety Signal Assessment Framework and their prioritization on the Signal Prioritization Matrix;
- provides a consolidated overview of the signals captured across all three activities, explicitly framed as a preliminary, sub-target dataset rather than a representative account of the Lanaken youth work field.

This report constitutes the underlying material for WP14 deliverable D9-16.2 ("Method(s) to determine what a local community signal is", shared with WP9-16) and for the WP14 monitoring & evaluation report (D9-16.3).

2. Process toolkit: determining and assessing a local community safety signal

To ensure that all eight COSY ecosystems apply a consistent, transparent and comparable method for identifying local community safety signals — while still allowing tailor-made facilitation per ecosystem and

target group — the COSY partnership developed a shared process toolkit. It consists of four complementary instruments, described below.

2.1 Working definition of a local community safety signal

Per the COSY Facilitator Notes, a local community safety signal is defined as:

"A recurring or emerging condition in a specific neighborhood that affects the safety, well-being or inclusion of young people, and which the local community recognizes as deserving attention or action."

A safety signal can relate to physical safety, psychological safety, social exclusion, unsafe public spaces, societal barriers, or (digital) side-effects of community conflicts. Importantly, signals are not individual incidents, but patterns or indicators shared across several participants. To structure the exploration of these signals, the toolkit works with a fixed list of 13–14 life domains, including education, police, justice, wellbeing, mobility, social media, gender, leisure and public space, among others. In WP14, this same domain structure was applied to signals youth workers raised both about the young people they support and about their own professional practice.

Four working principles apply throughout: voluntary participation, a safe conversational environment, confidentiality, and the leadership of youth voice — in WP14, interpreted as the leadership of youth workers' professional voice and frontline expertise.

2.2 Decision tree "Is it a local community safety signal?"

Every observation raised by youth workers is tested against a five-step decision tree before it is treated as a validated local community safety signal:

- 1. Has a safety concern been observed by youth or youth workers? (if no → not a signal: unrelated to safety)
- 2. Does it affect more than one young person? (if no → not a signal: not associated with the community)
- 3. Is the issue linked to a specific local environment? (if no → not a signal: not associated with local circumstances)
- 4. Is there a pattern or repeated experience? (if no → not a signal: not structurally embedded in the community)
- 5. Could community actors influence the situation? (if no → not a signal: not generated or moderated by the community)

Only observations that pass all five checks (yes/yes/yes/yes/yes) qualify as a confirmed local community safety signal. Given the small participant numbers in WP14 (see Section 3.1), most signals presented below are explicitly classified as Emerging rather than Confirmed, precisely because spread across multiple, independent participants — the fourth criterion above — could often not yet be established.

2.3 Facilitator notes and signal-capturing template

During each activity, the facilitator bundles raw observations per life domain in a structured overview (signal observation → signal exploration on frequency, impact, spread, urgency and change potential → signal validation yes/no), so that no observation is overlooked before validation against the decision tree.

2.4 Safety Signal Assessment Framework

Once an observation has passed the decision tree, it can be scored using the COSY Safety Signal Assessment Framework, which rates each candidate signal on five dimensions (1 = lowest, 5 = highest): Frequency, Impact,

Spread, Urgency, and Change potential. The combined score (range 5–25) is interpreted as: 5–10 Observation, 11–17 Emerging Signal, 18–25 Confirmed Safety Signal. This scoring was applied at activity level for two of the three WP14 activities (WP14.2 and WP14.3); the first activity (WP14.1) pre-dates the formal introduction of this scoring template at Lanaken level and is instead reported in the thematic-cluster format used in the source material.

2.5 Signal Prioritization Matrix

Finally, scored signals are plotted on the Signal Prioritization Matrix, which crosses "impact on youth safety" (low/high) against "ability of the community to act" (low/high), yielding four core response strategies: Monitor, Advocacy or policy dialogue, Quick community improvements, and Immediate pilot action. As in WP5, WP6, WP9 and WP13, this is extended locally with a "Protective Factor" sub-classification (prioritized as "Preserve & Strengthen") and additional labels such as "Further Exploration", "Organizational Reflection" and "Partnership Building" for signals needing further confirmation or a multi-actor response.

3. Youth work landscape in Lanaken

Lanaken is a municipality in the province of Limburg located on the Dutch border, directly adjacent to Maastricht. On 1 January 2025, Lanaken had approximately 26,500 inhabitants, of whom roughly one in six is under 18 and almost one in three is 60 or older — a relatively older population profile compared with many other COSY ecosystems.

Within professional youth work, two important structures are present: OverKop Lanaken, operated by Arktos in partnership with the local authority and CAW Limburg, targeting young people aged 12 to 25; and Uit De Marge (UDM), with one outreach youth worker active in the municipality, who also makes use of the OverKop house to reach and support young people. This means Lanaken has a youth work landscape characterised by a small number of professional youth workers relative to the municipality's population and geographic spread. As documented in the WP6 ecosystem context report, reaching young people directly in Lanaken already required an adapted, highly flexible outreach methodology due to the limited size of the professional youth work team. The same underlying capacity constraint — a small pool of professional youth workers, further reduced by the summer period during which WP14 fieldwork took place — directly shaped the participation levels documented in Section 3.1 below.

3.1 Participation shortfall against the 25-participant target

WP14 aimed to reach a minimum of 25 unique youth workers across its activities, in line with the target set for this work package. Despite proactive outreach, this target was not met: the three activities organized for WP14 together reached 13 youth workers (8 in WP14.1, 1 in WP14.2, and 4 in WP14.3).

Two compounding factors explain this shortfall. First, as set out above, the number of professional outreach youth workers active within the Lanaken ecosystem itself is limited, meaning the potential pool of directly connected participants was small from the outset — the same structural constraint documented for WP13 in the neighboring Dilsen-Stokkem ecosystem, which led both work packages to hold training sessions in the more centrally located city of Hasselt rather than in the home municipality alone. Second, WP14's fieldwork window fell during the summer holiday period, when youth workers' availability for a dedicated training activity is at its lowest: many were occupied with their organizations' own summer programming, camps and holiday activities, or were themselves on leave — a dynamic explicitly documented in WP14.1's own participant profile and consistent with the timing challenges reported for WP13.

In response, the training was opened beyond a single organization and offered at fixed, externally accessible dates and locations (Hasselt) to maximize the chance of reaching youth workers from across the wider region

connected to Lanaken. This mitigated, but did not fully resolve, the shortfall: the third and smallest activity (WP14.2) proceeded with a single participant rather than being cancelled, on the basis that even limited, individually captured signals retain value for the wider signal-capture effort.

This report is therefore submitted transparently as an incomplete work package relative to its original participation target. The signals captured remain genuine, professionally grounded observations and are reported in full below, but — as explicitly flagged throughout the source material itself — should be read as an initial, preliminary account rather than a representative picture of the Lanaken-connected youth work field.

4. Flip-thinking as a methodology for reaching youth workers

WP14 used an interactive Flip-thinking training as its vehicle for signal capture, chosen specifically because it offers participating youth workers something of direct professional value — concrete strategies for looking differently at stuck situations in their practice — while collecting signals as an integrated part of the same session, rather than through a stand-alone survey or interview.

The training combines a theoretical introduction to flip-thinking (including the shift from "yes, but" to "yes, and") with Berthold Gunster's 15 flip-thinking strategies, illustrated with youth-work examples, and a practical component in which participants work through their own cases using a Flip-thinking journal and accompanying method posters. Signal capture is integrated throughout via interactive Mentimeter questions on: situations where youth workers themselves get stuck; recurring "yes, but" reactions; situations requiring more understanding or "love"; problems youth workers seek solutions for; what young people struggle with most; under-used opportunities; and messages for policymakers and societal institutions.

For WP14, this format was applied with the flexibility the small-group and individual sessions required. Where a full Mentimeter-based session was possible (WP14.3), the standard multi-question format was used as designed. Where only a single participant was present (WP14.2), the facilitator deliberately set Mentimeter aside — judging it to feel artificial and unnecessarily formal for one person — and instead worked through the same questions as an oral, conversational exchange, adapting the practical Flip-thinking case exercise to be solved together with the participant rather than in small groups. WP14.1, the first and largest of the three activities, used a full group format with Mentimeter and is reported using the same thematic-clustering structure the source material itself used, ahead of the more granular, per-signal scoring format adopted for the two later activities.

5. Activities organized for WP14 with youth workers connected to Lanaken

Three Flip-thinking training activities were organized with outreach youth workers to realize OO1.2 within the Lanaken ecosystem. As explained in Section 3.1, all three were held in Hasselt rather than Lanaken itself, for accessibility reasons, and together fell short of the 25-participant target. They are reported separately below, numbered WP14.1 through WP14.3.

Event	Date / time	Location	Format	Participants
WP14.1	13/07/2026	Hasselt	Flip-thinking training with integrated Mentimeter signal capture (group format)	8 (6 M, 1 F, 1 non-binary)
WP14.2	29/07/2026	Hasselt	Flip-thinking training adapted to an	1 (1 F)

			individual, conversational format (no Mentimeter)	
WP14.3	10/08/2026	Hasselt	Flip-thinking training with integrated Mentimeter signal capture (small-group format)	4 (4 F)

WP14.1: Flip-thinking training — Hasselt

Description

This was the first of the three WP14 signal-capture activities with youth workers connected to the Lanaken ecosystem, framed as a Flip-thinking training offered as a quid pro quo for youth work and youth development professionals in the broader Lanaken region, with signal capture on the poles of safety and unsafety integrated throughout.

The training used a presentation and interactive Mentimeter questions and results, following the same core design as the other Flip-thinking sessions in the COSY project (introduction to flip-thinking, the 15 strategies, and a practical case component).

Signals identified — WP14.1 (thematic-cluster format)

Findings are presented in two parts, mirroring the two central Mentimeter prompts used during the training: which situations most need "love" (i.e. sustained care and attention) within youth work, and what youth workers see as possible solutions. Each part clusters around several sub-themes, as identified in the source report.

A. Where does youth work most need "love"?

Responses clustered around three themes.

Societal inequality and systemic pressure:

- *Young people in vulnerable neighborhoods, systemic racism, radicalization and truancy were named as situations requiring the most engagement.*
- *A recurring tension was noted between young people and institutions (school, "the other side") that hold positions of power without sufficient insight into young people's lived experience.*

Unconditional acceptance:

- *Youth workers explicitly named the need for unconditionality toward behavior they themselves do not understand or endorse — requiring consciously sustained empathy rather than spontaneous sympathy.*
- *Repairing young people's broken self-confidence, after accumulated hurt, recurred as a core task.*

Recognition and being heard:

- *"Affirming" and "respecting" were named as concrete methods: showing young people they have qualities, helping them build from their own strengths, and paying attention to anyone who does not feel heard.*
- *Colleagues were also named as a subject of concern — signaling that "love" within youth work is directed not only at young people, but also at the team and the sector itself.*

B. What solutions do youth workers see?

Four lines of thinking emerged.

System change versus individual guidance:

- *A clear tension exists between reforming education/policy on one hand and individually adjusting course with young people on the other.*
- *Youth workers look for what does and does not work, rather than holding rigidly to existing approaches.*

Identity, safety and encounter:

- *Jointly exploring identity, and creating safe spaces for encounter, are seen as fundamental building blocks for sustainable solutions.*

Need for discretionary space:

- *A strongly recurring insight: society is experienced as "black and white", while youth workers need room to help young people learn from mistakes — yet are simultaneously obliged to report those same mistakes. This is explicitly named as a grey zone/tension between a pedagogical approach and mandatory reporting duties.*
- *This touches a structural dilemma: youth work requires trust and room for error, while policy frameworks often require control and accountability.*

Public image and positioning of youth work itself:

- *Positive framing of young people, and pushing back against the frame that youth work is "nuisance control", recurred.*
- *Youth work explicitly positions itself as prevention, with added value beyond problem-focused work — and seeks ways to "get everyone on board" within a society that expects inclusion/adaptation.*

Core message for this report

The two lines of questioning show a consistent tension between system and individual: youth workers invest emotionally in recognizing and affirming individual young people, while simultaneously running into structural constraints (policy, mandatory reporting, public image) that narrow their pedagogical room for manoeuvre. A possible recommendation for the European-level report would be to advocate for more discretionary/pedagogical space for youth workers within policy frameworks, and for structural recognition of youth work as a prevention instrument rather than as nuisance control.

[Photo](#)



WP14.2: Flip-thinking training — Hasselt (individual format)

Description

The second WP14 activity took place in Hasselt, starting at 14:30, and consisted of a Flip-thinking training in which the same methodology was simultaneously used to capture signals from youth work.

A single youth worker took part in this activity (one woman). The limited turnout must be read within the broader context of the period: activities for youth workers were organized during the summer holiday period, when youth workers' availability was limited. Many were involved in summer programming, on leave, or unable to free up time for a separate training — resulting in one participant for this activity.

The small group size naturally shaped how the training and signal capture were carried out. The original methodology foresees using Mentimeter to interactively collect answers and signals during the training; with only one participant, this approach felt unnatural and unnecessarily formal, so it was deliberately not used. Instead, the questions were worked through together, orally, during the training, creating an individual conversation in which the participant had room to further explain her experiences and observations from youth work. The practical component of the Flip-thinking training was likewise adapted to this context: the case was discussed and resolved together with the participant.

Although the limited turnout means the results cannot be considered representative of youth workers in Lanaken, the individual character of the activity did produce substantive signals relevant for further capture.

Signals identified and assessed — WP14.2

Signals were captured using the questions integrated into the Flip-thinking training. Because only one youth worker took part, the signals below should be understood as the professional observations and experiences of a single youth worker, and are not generalized to the wider field without further confirmation.

Signal 1 — The safety and sense of safety of young people requires particular attention, according to the youth worker

Life domain(s): Wellbeing / Public space

Asked which situations currently require the most "love" within youth work, the participant explicitly named safety and the sense of safety among young people. She linked safety to young people's ability to have their own place and be themselves — approaching safety more broadly than physical safety alone, also encompassing room for identity, recognition and individual talents.

Illustrative signals:

- *"Feelings of safety and unsafety among young people."*
- *"Everyone must get their own little place and be allowed to be who they are."*
- *"Everyone has their own talents."*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	2
Impact	5
Spread	1
Urgency	4
Change potential	4
Total score	16/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Further Exploration / Advocacy

Motivation:

Potential impact is rated high, but frequency and spread are limited since this signal, within this activity, comes from a single youth worker. The signal is therefore an Emerging Safety Signal; further capture with other youth workers and young people is needed to examine which forms of unsafety are experienced and in what context.

Signal 2 — Young people struggle with challenges around identity, recognition and feeling unheard

Life domain(s): Wellbeing / Other: social dynamics

An important cluster in the answers concerns identity and recognition. According to the youth worker, young people today strongly struggle with their identity, the feeling of not being heard, and being quickly labelled by others — connecting to her answer on what youth workers currently try to find solutions for, where strengthening young people's voice and creating their own space to develop their identity were explicitly named. Together, these answers point to a need for young people to be seen and heard for who they are, without being quickly judged from existing images or labels.

Illustrative signals:

- "Identity."
- "Not feeling heard."
- "Being quickly labelled."
- "Strengthening young people's voice."
- "Own identity and own place for young people."

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	5
Spread	1
Urgency	4
Change potential	5
Total score	19/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Further Exploration / Quick Community Improvement

Motivation:

Frequency within this individual conversation is relatively high but spread remains low since all statements come from the same participant. Change potential is rated high, since youth work can directly invest in space for identity, participation and strengthening young people's voice; further capture is needed to establish the extent to which young people themselves confirm these experiences.

Signal 3 — Pressure on young people's wellbeing is increasing

Life domain(s): Wellbeing / Social media

The youth worker expressed explicit concern about young people's wellbeing, describing increasing pressure alongside ever-higher expectations and constantly rising quality demands. Social media was named as a contributing factor, with comparison to others and high expectations seen as sources of pressure. Her statement, "Where is the piece of wellbeing for young people?", exposes an important tension: whether, within the expectations placed on young people, sufficient attention remains for their wellbeing.

Illustrative signals:

- "Social media, comparison and high expectations."
- "Where is the piece of wellbeing for young people, because the pressure keeps growing and quality has to constantly go up?"

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
-----------	-------------

Frequency	3
Impact	5
Spread	1
Urgency	5
Change potential	4
Total score	18/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Further Exploration / Advocacy

Motivation:

Impact and urgency are rated high given the potential consequences for young people's mental wellbeing; spread remains limited to one professional observation. The signal requires further confirmation with young people and other youth workers; if more broadly confirmed, it may be relevant for dialogue with education, wellbeing and policy actors.

Signal 4 — School drop-out is a challenge for youth workers to try to find solutions for

Life domain(s): Education

School drop-out was explicitly named as one of the situations youth workers currently try to find solutions for. The theme was not further explored during this activity, so there is insufficient information to establish what causes the participant sees behind drop-out, or which groups of young people she considers most affected. Its spontaneous mention as a theme youth workers try to act on nonetheless makes it relevant to carry forward into further signal capture.

Illustrative signals:

- "School drop-out."

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	1
Impact	5
Spread	1
Urgency	4
Change potential	3
Total score	14/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal

Prioritization	Further Exploration
-----------------------	------------------------

Motivation:

Potential impact is rated high, since drop-out can affect young people's further educational and societal position; however, based on this activity there is insufficient information about scale, causes or specific groups affected. The signal is therefore provisionally classified as Emerging, and further capture is necessary.

Signal 5 — Young people's lived experience is, according to the youth worker, too often approached through a problem lens

Life domain(s): Other: social dynamics

A recurring element in the answers concerns how professionals and societal actors look at young people. According to the participant, situations involving young people are viewed too narrowly, with focus too often on what is going wrong. Against this, she places a more talent-based approach: young people have their own talents and possibilities that should more strongly serve as a starting point. The signal therefore concerns not only young people themselves, but also how organizations, professionals and policy look at and engage with them.

Illustrative signals:

- "Looking at young people's situations too little and too narrowly."
- "Often the focus is only on what's going wrong."
- "Looking more from talents."
- "Everyone has their own talents."
- "Working in a talent-focused way."

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	4
Spread	1
Urgency	3
Change potential	5
Total score	17/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Quick Community Improvement

Motivation:

This theme recurred at several points in the conversation, giving it a relatively high frequency within this activity, though spread remains limited given its individual character. Change potential is high: youth work

organizations and other local actors can deliberately choose an approach centered on young people's talents, possibilities and strengths rather than problems alone.

Signal 6 — Young people need to be more strongly involved, with more room for their voice

Life domain(s): Other: social dynamics

Participation recurred at several points. According to the youth worker, youth workers today try to strengthen young people's voices, but opportunities remain to involve young people more. This connects directly to the earlier signal that young people do not always feel heard, positioning the strengthening of young people's voices both as an existing task of youth work and as a further opportunity.

Illustrative signals:

- "Strengthening young people's voice."
- "Not feeling heard."
- "Involving young people more."

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	4
Spread	1
Urgency	4
Change potential	5
Total score	18/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Quick Community Improvement

Motivation:

Frequency within the conversation is relatively high, but again no broad spread can be established with a single participant. Change potential is rated high: within youth work, local projects and participation trajectories, young people can be given relatively direct room to think along and influence decisions affecting their lived experience.

Signal 7 — More mutual exchange between young people, youth work and societal actors could strengthen understanding

Life domain(s): Other: institutional

Asked what she would want to convey to policymakers or societal institutions, the participant emphasized the importance of exchange in both directions: more should be told to each other, and more mutual understanding is needed. This points to a need for dialogue in which information does not flow solely from institutions toward young people or youth work, but in which experiences from young people and youth work are also genuinely fed back.

Illustrative signals:

- *"The importance of exchange in both directions: telling each other more and more understanding."*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	2
Impact	4
Spread	1
Urgency	3
Change potential	5
Total score	15/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Advocacy / Policy Dialogue

Motivation:

Although named by only one participant, this connects substantively to other signals around being heard and youth participation. Change potential is high, since local dialogue moments and participatory structures can be used to narrow the distance between young people, youth work and societal institutions.

Signal 8 — Colleagues and others form an important source of support for youth workers, while problems are also internalized

Life domain(s): Other: social dynamics (mixed protective/risk)

The question "What do you usually do when you get stuck at work?" surfaced a relevant signal about the youth worker's own wellbeing and coping mechanisms. On one hand, the participant indicated letting problems "eat away" at her and ruminating on them; on the other, she named talking with others as a way of coping with difficult situations. This signal shows two sides: difficult situations within youth work can also form a personal mental burden for youth workers, while contact with others can serve as a potential protective factor when they get stuck.

Illustrative signals:

- *"Letting it eat away at myself and ruminating."*
- *"Talking with others."*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	2
Impact	4
Spread	1

Urgency	3
Change potential	4
Total score	14/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal / Protective Factor
Prioritization	Further Exploration / Preserve & Strengthen

Motivation:

Since this comes from a single personal experience, it cannot be concluded that this reflects a broader wellbeing issue within youth work. It is, however, relevant to examine in future activities how other youth workers cope with difficult situations and what support they experience in doing so.

Overall observation — Activity 2 (WP14.2)

Despite only one youth worker taking part, the individual conversation surfaced several substantively connected themes. Identity, being heard, wellbeing, participation and how young people are viewed run as a common thread through the answers. The youth worker describes several challenges young people face — pressure and high expectations, social comparison, school drop-out, feeling unheard, being quickly labelled, and identity-related difficulties — while also clearly articulating a preferred direction: talent-focused work, more strongly involving young people, offering room to be oneself, and creating more mutual dialogue. The individual format of the activity was not solely a limitation: not using Mentimeter made it possible to discuss the questions directly and explore answers further during the training, and the Flip-thinking case could likewise be worked out together with the participant — giving the training more the character of an interactive one-to-one conversation. Methodologically, however, it remains important that all captured signals originate from one female youth worker (100%); based on this activity alone, the signals cannot be considered broadly shared within youth work. They constitute, in the first instance, emerging signals and professional observations that can be confirmed, nuanced or supplemented during subsequent activities.

[Photo](#)



WP14.3: Flip-thinking training — Hasselt (small-group format)

Description

The third and final WP14 Flip-thinking training for youth workers connected to the Lanaken ecosystem took place in Hasselt. In total, four youth workers took part, all women.

The group participated enthusiastically, with good energy throughout the activity. Participants actively engaged with the different components of the training and brought in multiple perspectives from their own experience and professional practice. The limited group size allowed room for interaction and further exchange around the questions raised during the training, and the Mentimeter questions produced several signals concerning both youth workers' daily practice and the challenges, needs and opportunities they see among young people.

Signals identified and assessed — WP14.3

Based on participants' answers and the conversations that arose during the training, signals were thematically clustered, following the same reference structure as the earlier WP14 and WP13 reports: rather than structuring by individual question, answers that are substantively connected were bundled into broader signals.

Signal 1 — Youth workers encounter resistance and convictions that can limit change

Life domain(s): Other: institutional

Answers to the question about frequently heard "yes, but" statements reveal various forms of resistance. Participants named both practical limitations, such as time and financial resources, and convictions about what is achievable within a particular local context, alongside generational differences and a feeling of not being understood — together illustrating how existing convictions and expectations can limit room to look at situations differently.

Illustrative signals:

- "I didn't have time."
- "I forgot."
- "I've already tried everything."

- "I didn't understand it."
- "You have to be a bit realistic."
- "It's far too difficult."
- "We're not in Brussels or another big city here."
- "That's not how it works here, you have to follow the right channels."
- "They don't understand us."
- "We're a different generation and grow up differently."
- "Everything costs a lot of money nowadays."

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	4
Spread	4
Urgency	3
Change potential	4
Total score	19/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal
Prioritization	Quick Community Improvement / Organisational Reflection

Motivation:

Change potential is rated relatively high because these thought patterns can be made discussable within professional practice; reflection, exchange and Flip-thinking itself can help examine existing assumptions and surface alternative courses of action.

Signal 2 — Youth workers use reflection, collegial support and taking distance when they get stuck

Life domain(s): Other: social dynamics (protective)

When youth workers themselves get stuck, several strategies emerge to regain perspective. Participants named sitting down with colleagues, young people and possibly partners; a chat with a direct colleague; seeking a new observation or angle; visualizing the problem; walking; going for a run; meditating; and consciously taking distance and doing something re-energizing. Notably, both connection with others and deliberate distance are used — youth workers seek other perspectives through discussing situations with colleagues, young people or partners, while also trying to create enough mental space to return to a problem later. Collegial support is therefore an important resource, alongside individual strategies for reflection and recovery.

Illustrative signals:

- *Sitting down with colleagues, young people and possibly partners.*
- *A chat with a direct colleague.*
- *Seeking a new observation, view or angle.*
- *Visualising the problem.*
- *Walking.*
- *Going for a run.*
- *Meditating.*
- *Taking distance and doing something that re-energises.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	5
Impact	4
Spread	5
Urgency	3
Change potential	5
Total score	22/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal — Protective Factor
Prioritization	Preserve & Strengthen

Motivation:

This signal is treated as an important protective factor. Youth workers do not appear to carry difficult situations solely on their own but draw on their professional network and personal strategies to regain perspective; organizations can further support this existing strength by providing room for consultation, intervention, reflection and recovery.

Signal 3 — Young people with little future perspective need affirmation and adults who keep believing in them

Life domain(s): Wellbeing

Asked which situations currently require the most "love" in youth work, participants explicitly referred to young people who doubt themselves and young people who experience little future perspective, naming: when a young person doubts; showing young people that things can be different; strongly investing in affirmation when future perspective is low; and continuing to believe in young people. These answers point to the importance of an environment in which young people are not judged solely on their current situation or difficulties — when young people themselves see little perspective, adults' continued belief in their possibilities can be an important supporting factor, with affirmation understood not only as encouragement but as continuing to make visible possibilities young people struggle to see themselves.

Illustrative signals:

- *When a young person doubts.*
- *Showing young people that things can be different.*
- *Strongly investing in affirmation when there is little future perspective.*
- *Continuing to believe in young people.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	5
Spread	4
Urgency	4
Change potential	5
Total score	22/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal
Prioritization	Immediate Pilot Action / Protective Strengthening

Motivation:

Impact is rated high because a lack of future perspective can affect motivation, self-image, participation and the choices young people make. Change potential within youth work is relatively large: affirmation, talent-focused work, making possibilities visible, and offering positive relationships are all elements youth workers can directly act on.

Signal 4 — Structural basic problems affect young people's developmental opportunities

Life domain(s): Housing / Wellbeing / Education / Other: socio-economic

A considerable number of answers about problems youth workers seek solutions for concern structural circumstances: financial poverty, unemployment, food shortages, young people without a home or fixed place to sleep, school drop-out because of wider problems, and waiting lists within support services. One participant summarized this as "back to basics": providing for basic needs. These answers show that problems young people face cannot be viewed solely through individual behavior: when basic conditions such as housing, food and financial security are missing, this can affect multiple other life domains, confronting youth workers with issues that can exceed their own field of work while directly affecting the young people they support.

Illustrative signals:

- *Financial poverty.*
- *Unemployment.*
- *Food shortage.*
- *Young people without a home or fixed place to sleep.*
- *School drop-out because of wider problems.*

- *Waiting lists within support services.*
- *"Back to basics."*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	5
Impact	5
Spread	5
Urgency	5
Change potential	3
Total score	23/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal
Prioritization	Immediate Partnership / Policy Dialogue

Motivation:

Impact and urgency are rated high because problems around housing, food and material security can directly affect young people's wellbeing and developmental opportunities. Change potential from youth work alone is more limited: youth workers can signal, support and guide young people, but structural solutions require cooperation with support services, local authorities and other societal actors.

Signal 5 — Young people run into waiting lists and thresholds to support

Life domain(s): Wellbeing / Other: institutional

Alongside broader socio-economic problems, participants specifically referred to the ability to help young people further without long waiting lists. This signal points to a tension between the moment a young person needs support and the moment specialized help actually becomes available; youth workers are often positioned close to young people and can signal problems early, but when referral is accompanied by long waiting times, a period can arise in which the need for support persists without appropriate help being immediately available.

Illustrative signals:

- *Helping young people further without long waiting lists.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	3
Impact	5
Spread	3

Urgency	5
Change potential	3
Total score	19/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Further Exploration / Partnership

Motivation:

Although named less broadly than several other signals, potential impact is large: when young people need support but cannot access appropriate help in time, their situation can come under further pressure in the meantime. Further capture is advisable to establish how widely this problem is experienced within the ecosystem; the theme also calls for cooperation with support and wellbeing actors.

Signal 6 — Young people need room in public space without automatically being seen as a nuisance

Life domain(s): Public space

Young people's position in public space came through clearly. According to participants, youth workers seek solutions for young people's presence in public space without residents experiencing this presence as a nuisance. When discussing opportunities for young people, participants referred to local authorities' role in making towns and municipalities more attractive for young people, noting that playgrounds are increasingly disappearing; the message to policy-makers likewise included "public space is for everyone" and the aim of making public space more attractive again — pointing to a tension between young people's need to be present in public space and how other users of that space interpret their presence.

Illustrative signals:

- *Young people's presence in public spaces without residents experiencing it as a nuisance.*
- *The role of local authorities in making municipalities more attractive for young people; playgrounds are increasingly disappearing.*
- *"Public space is for everyone."*
- *Making public space more attractive again.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	4
Spread	4
Urgency	4
Change potential	4
Total score	20/25

Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal
Prioritization	Quick Community Improvement / Policy Dialogue

Motivation:

Change potential is relatively large because local authorities, youth workers, young people and residents can jointly explore how public space can be made accessible and attractive for different users.

Signal 7 — Young people encounter misunderstanding, prejudice and a lack of a listening ear

Life domain(s): Other: social dynamics

A strongly recurring theme concerns the relationship between young people and their environment. Participants named a lack of a listening ear, not being understood, misunderstandings from residents and people in the surrounding environment, and prejudice, alongside the observation that young people need someone who believes in them. These answers point to a broader need for recognition: young people can run into concrete structural thresholds, but also into how others look at them, and when they experience being prejudged or insufficiently heard, this can affect their sense of connectedness with their environment.

Illustrative signals:

- *No listening ear.*
- *Not being understood.*
- *Misunderstandings from residents and people in the surrounding environment.*
- *Prejudice.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	5
Spread	4
Urgency	4
Change potential	4
Total score	21/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal
Prioritization	Advocacy / Partnership

Motivation:

Impact is rated high because such experiences can affect young people's trust in adults, institutions and their wider environment. Youth work can take on an important bridging function here, but structural change also requires dialogue with the actors young people encounter and attention to the public image of young people.

Signal 8 — Young people's context shapes which opportunities they can access

Life domain(s): Housing / Education / Other: socio-economic

Youth workers explicitly referred to the influence of the context in which young people grow up, naming the home situation, the school situation, the financial situation, and opportunities that remain unused as a result. These answers show that opportunities do not depend solely on motivation or individual effort: the circumstances a young person finds themselves in can co-determine which possibilities are accessible, connecting to the earlier signals on poverty, school drop-out, housing and access to support.

Illustrative signals:

- *The home situation.*
- *The school situation.*
- *The financial situation.*
- *Opportunities that remain unused as a result.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	5
Spread	4
Urgency	4
Change potential	3
Total score	20/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal
Prioritization	Partnership / Advocacy

Motivation:

Impact is rated high; change potential from a single organization is more limited and calls for broader cooperation between youth work, education, wellbeing and other involved actors.

Signal 9 — Social media and comparison can put pressure on young people's self-image

Life domain(s): Social media / Wellbeing

A specific signal concerns the low self-image that can arise from comparison via social media. Participants observe that young people can constantly compare themselves with others, confronted with images and expectations against which they measure themselves, which can affect how young people judge themselves and their own possibilities. This signal connects to the need for affirmation raised elsewhere in the activity: when external comparison is strongly present, recognizing and making visible individual qualities and talents can form an important counterforce.

Illustrative signals:

- *Young people constantly compare themselves with others via social media.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	3
Impact	4
Spread	3
Urgency	3
Change potential	4
Total score	17/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal
Prioritization	Further Exploration / Preventive Action

Motivation:

Although this theme recurred less frequently within this activity, its impact may be relevant to young people's psychosocial wellbeing and identity development. Further signal capture is advisable to determine how widely this is experienced; meanwhile, youth work has possibilities to invest preventively in self-image, talents, identity and critical engagement with comparison.

Signal 10 — Talent development and strengths-based work remain under-used

Life domain(s): Other: social dynamics

Asked which opportunities are currently insufficiently seen, strong emphasis was placed on young people's talents and strengths. Participants named: young people's talents being insufficiently seen by their environment; young people making a neighborhood liveable and youthful; young people being allowed to more confidently show their strengths; every child excelling at something; starting from a child's strength; young people developing strong strategies to survive difficult situations; and these strengths being potentially inspiring for other young people and for society. A clear strength-based perspective emerges here: behavior and strategies young people have developed from difficult circumstances can also contain skills and resilience, and participants see opportunities to more strongly recognize these qualities and use them as a starting point.

Illustrative signals:

- *Young people's talents are insufficiently seen by their environment.*
- *Young people make a neighborhood liveable and youthful.*
- *Young people should dare to show their strengths more.*
- *Every child excels at something.*
- *Starting from the child's strength.*
- *Young people develop strong strategies to survive difficult situations.*
- *These strengths can be inspiring for other young people and for society.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	5
Impact	4
Spread	5
Urgency	3
Change potential	5
Total score	22/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal — Opportunity
Prioritization	Quick Community Improvement / Pilot Action

Motivation:

Change potential is rated high: within youth work, relatively direct investment is possible in talent recognition, positive affirmation, responsibility, and creating opportunities for young people to apply their qualities.

Signal 11 — Cooperation between different actors offers opportunities

Life domain(s): Other: institutional

Alongside individual talent development, cooperation with schools, police and other actors was also named as an opportunity that could be further used. The challenges young people face span multiple life domains: youth workers have insight into certain aspects of young people's lived experience, while schools, support services, local authorities and other actors are involved from different positions — pointing to possibilities for more strongly connecting knowledge, perspectives and responsibilities.

Illustrative signals:

- *Cooperation with schools, police and other actors.*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	3
Impact	4
Spread	3
Urgency	3
Change potential	5

Total score	18/25
Classification	Emerging Safety Signal — Opportunity
Prioritization	Partnership Building

Motivation:

Although raised less frequently, change potential is large: several problems named during the activity — including school drop-out, public space, poverty and access to support — cannot be addressed by youth work alone. Further strengthening cooperation can contribute to more integrated support for young people.

Signal 12 — Youth workers ask policymakers to move closer to young people's daily reality

Life domain(s): Other: institutional

The message toward policymakers and societal institutions was clearly oriented toward greater proximity to practice. Participants suggested that policymakers should shadow practice for a certain period; that public space belongs to everyone and should be made more attractive again; that "being kind and listening costs no money"; and that investing in young people is investing in the future. The call to "shadow" points to a need for experience-based knowledge of young people's lived experience and youth workers' daily practice, suggesting that policy decisions can align more closely with young people when policymakers do not view situations solely from a distance but also directly familiarize themselves with the context in which young people and youth workers operate.

Illustrative signals:

- *Policymakers should shadow practice for a certain period.*
- *"Public space belongs to everyone and must become more attractive again."*
- *"Being kind and listening costs no money."*
- *"Investing in young people is investing in the future."*

Assessment (Safety Signal Assessment Framework) and Prioritization :

Criterion	Score (1–5)
Frequency	4
Impact	4
Spread	4
Urgency	3
Change potential	4
Total score	19/25
Classification	Confirmed Safety Signal

Prioritization	Policy Dialogue / Advocacy
-----------------------	----------------------------------

Motivation:

Change potential is relatively large because direct contact and dialogue between policymakers, youth workers and young people can contribute to greater mutual understanding and policy that better aligns with young people's lived experience.

Overarching finding — Activity 3 (WP14.3)

Signal capture shows a combination of individual, relational and structural factors that, according to youth workers, affect young people. On one hand, concrete structural problems are named — poverty, housing problems, unemployment, school drop-out, waiting lists and a shortage of accessible space for young people. On the other hand, relational and psychosocial themes feature strongly: young people do not always feel understood, encounter prejudice, compare themselves via social media, and can have little confidence in their own future. At the same time, strong emphasis is placed on young people's possibilities and qualities: talent development, affirmation, future perspective and continuing to believe in young people recur repeatedly as important levers. Youth workers' own position also emerges when they get stuck, they draw on collegial support, reflection and deliberately taking distance, while operating within a context where structural problems and existing convictions cannot always be changed directly from within youth work. Finally, the signals point to the importance of connection between young people, youth work, policy and other societal actors — public space, cooperation with schools and police, and the call for policymakers to shadow practice all show a need for greater mutual understanding and shared involvement in young people's lived experience.

General assessment — Activity 3 (WP14.3)

Within this activity, structural basic problems affecting young people's developmental opportunities (23/25) receive the highest score: poverty, housing, food, unemployment and school drop-out show that young people's safety and wellbeing cannot be seen apart from their broader living conditions. Collegial support and reflection among youth workers (22/25) form an important protective factor, and affirmation/future perspective (22/25) and talent development/strengths-based work (22/25) also feature strongly, showing that clear protective factors and levers for action exist alongside structural problems. A second cluster concerns young people's relationship with their environment: misunderstanding, prejudice and lack of a listening ear (21/25) and young people's position in public space (20/25) point to the importance of recognition, connectedness and room for young people, while the broader home, school and financial context (20/25) also shapes which opportunities young people can actually access. Other signals require further confirmation: waiting lists and thresholds to support (19/25) and social media/comparison and self-image (17/25) deserve further capture in other activities. Finally, the results point to several possibilities for action: strength-based work, cooperation between actors, strengthening public space for young people, and more direct contact between policy-makers and daily practice all offer concrete anchor points for further follow-up.

[Photo](#)



6. Consolidated overview of identified signals and context

Together, the three WP14 activities engaged 13 outreach youth workers (6 male, 6 female, 1 non-binary) connected to the Lanaken ecosystem, reached through Flip-thinking training sessions held in Hasselt. This falls short of the 25-participant target set for this work package, for the reasons set out in Section 3.1. The consolidated analysis below should be read with this limitation explicitly in mind: it reflects a genuine but preliminary signal-capture effort, not a representative account of the Lanaken-connected youth work field.

6.1 Cross-activity comparison of scored signals (WP14.2 and WP14.3)

WP14.1 is excluded from this scored comparison, as its source material predates the introduction of the per-signal scoring template and is reported in thematic-cluster form. Its themes are nonetheless integrated into the narrative discussion in Section 6.3 below.

Signal theme	WP14.2 (n=1)	WP14.3 (n=4)	Cross-activity observation
Being heard, recognition and identity	19/25 — Emerging — Further Exploration / Quick Community Improvement	21/25 — Confirmed — Advocacy / Partnership (as "misunderstanding, prejudice, lack of listening ear")	The same underlying theme recurs across both scored activities and moves from Emerging (single participant) to Confirmed (small group), consistent with the decision-tree logic that spread across independent participants strengthens a signal's status.
Structural/socio-economic basic problems (poverty,	16–18/25 range across related signals (safety/wellbeing,	23/25 — Confirmed — Immediate Partnership / Policy	The clearest example of a signal gaining confirmation strength with more participants: named but

housing, drop-out, waiting lists)	school drop-out) — all Emerging	Dialogue ("back to basics")	scored more cautiously by the single WP14.2 participant and scored as the single highest signal of the whole work package once corroborated by four independent participants in WP14.3.	
Affirmation, future perspective and continued belief in young people	Present within the identity/recognition signal, not scored separately	22/25 — Confirmed — Immediate Pilot Action / Protective Strengthening	A signal effectively unique to WP14.3, where it emerged as one of the two highest-scoring themes of the activity — a concrete, actionable finding for a work package that otherwise yielded mostly Emerging signals.	
Talent-based / strengths-based approach	17/25 — Emerging — Quick Community Improvement	22/25 — Confirmed (Opportunity) — Quick Community Improvement / Pilot Action	Raised independently in both activities with consistent direction (moving from problem-focused to strengths-focused framing) and near-identical Prioritization, despite the large difference in participant numbers — a reasonably robust, opportunity-framed signal.	
Youth workers' own coping strategies (colleagues, reflection, taking distance)	14/25 — Emerging/Protective Factor — Further Exploration / Preserve & Strengthen	22/25 — Confirmed Protective Factor — Preserve & Strengthen	Both activities converge on the same substantive finding (colleagues and reflection as a key coping resource) though the WP14.2 participant additionally disclosed a more troubling coping pattern (internalizing/ruminating) not echoed in WP14.3 — worth flagging for careful follow-up rather than treating the two activities as fully equivalent on this theme.	
Two-way exchange between young	15/25 — Emerging — Advocacy / Policy Dialogue	19/25 — Confirmed — Policy Dialogue /	A consistent call across both activities, sharpened in WP14.3 into a specific,	

people, youth work and policymakers		Advocacy ("shadow practice for a period")	concrete proposal (policymakers shadowing practice) not present in the single-participant activity.
Young people's presence in public space	Not raised in WP14.2	20/25 — Confirmed — Quick Community Improvement / Policy Dialogue	Raised only in the larger activity; consistent with the equivalent public-space signals raised directly by young people in Lanaken (WP6).
Social media / comparison and self-image	Referenced within the wellbeing signal (18/25), not scored separately	17/25 — Emerging — Further Exploration / Preventive Action	A consistently Emerging-level concern in both activities, never reaching Confirmed status — appropriately flagged for further capture rather than over-stated.

6.2 Signals grouped by prioritization category (all three activities)

- Confirmed Safety Signals (WP14.3 only, given WP14.2's single-participant spread limitation): structural basic problems (23/25); affirmation/future perspective (22/25); talent-based/strengths-based work (22/25, Opportunity); collegial coping (22/25, Protective Factor); misunderstanding/lack of listening ear (21/25); public space (20/25); context determining opportunity (20/25); policy-makers shadowing practice (19/25); resistance/"yes, but" thinking (19/25).
- Emerging Safety Signals (WP14.2 in full, plus WP14.3's remaining themes): all eight WP14.2 signals (safety/sense of safety; identity/recognition; wellbeing pressure; school drop-out; problem-focused framing of young people; participation/voice; two-way exchange; colleagues/internalizing as a mixed signal); WP14.3's waiting lists/thresholds to support (19/25) and social media/self-image (17/25); WP14.3's cooperation between actors (18/25, Opportunity).
- No signal across any WP14 activity was classified in the "Monitor" category.

6.3 Recurring patterns across the three activities

- Despite the small and varying group sizes, several themes recurred consistently across all three activities: the need for young people to be genuinely heard and recognized (WP14.1's "recognition and being heard" cluster; WP14.2's identity/recognition signal; WP14.3's misunderstanding/listening-ear signal); a tension between structural, system-level constraints and individual, relational youth work (explicit in WP14.1's core message; echoed in WP14.2 and WP14.3's structural-problem and policy-dialogue signals); and a consistently strengths-based counter-narrative, with youth workers in all three activities explicitly pushing back against a purely problem-focused view of young people.
- The clearest example of a signal gaining strength through independent corroboration is the structural/basic-needs theme: raised cautiously by a single participant in WP14.2 and then confirmed as the single highest-scoring signal of the entire work package (23/25) once independently

corroborated by four participants in WP14.3 — a textbook illustration of why the COSY decision tree treats spread across independent participants as a distinct validation criterion.

- WP14.1's distinctive contribution — not captured in the same form in WP14.2 or WP14.3 — is its explicit naming of the tension between a pedagogical, error-tolerant approach and youth workers' simultaneous mandatory reporting obligations, described in the source material as a "grey zone" between pedagogy and compliance. This is a structurally important finding that later activities did not independently re-raise and is flagged here for explicit follow-up rather than being lost in the consolidated framework.
- The single WP14.2 participant's disclosure of internalizing and ruminating on work-related problems — alongside also seeking support from others — is a more concerning individual data point than anything raised in WP14.3, and is not something the consolidated table above can meaningfully average away; it is flagged individually for care rather than folded into the general "collegial support" protective-factor narrative.

6.4 Addressing the participation shortfall

- Treat the signals in this report as a first, preliminary layer for the Lanaken youth-worker strand, and organize at least one further WP14 activity — ideally outside the summer holiday period and/or embedded within an existing team meeting or network event, mirroring the successful network-event recruitment approach used for WP13 — specifically aimed at closing the gap to the original 25-participant target.

This document was produced in the framework of the CERV 2021–2027 programme, funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are those of the organizers and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union.