

**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:	WP8
Event name:	Local community safety signals of young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally in Amsterdam New-West
Type:	Training
In situ/online:	In situ
Location:	The Netherlands 1. De Centrale, Ottho Heldringstraat 1, Amsterdam 2. De Kit, Bos en Lommerweg 380, 1061DJ Amsterdam West 3. De Kit, Bos en Lommerweg 380, 1061DJ Amsterdam West 4. Termini 22, 1022LB Amsterdam
Date(s):	1. 18/06/2026 2. 01/07/2026 3. 09/07/2026 4. 10/07/2026
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.uitdemarge.be/cosy/
Participants	
Female:	1. 13 2. 0 3. 1 4. 1
Male:	1. 0 2. 4 3. 4 4. 2
Non-binary:	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 4. 0
From country 1 [name]:	The Netherlands
...	
Total number of participants:	25

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 8 (WP8) of the COSY project — "Local community safety signals of young people in Amsterdam New-West at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally" — in fulfilment of specific objective SO1 ("Gaining insight into local community safety signals behind the societal safety symptoms") and, more specifically, operational objective OO1.1 ("Discovering and determining societal local community safety signals from and with youngsters").

In line with COSY's Phase 1 methodology, WP8 uses the co-design principle and the flip-thinking Cypher method to give the primary target group — young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally — an equal and safe space to voice what causes them to feel unsafe or unsettled (unrest) in their local community, and where and why this occurs. Four activities were organized in the Amsterdam New-West ecosystem to this end, each building on an existing relationship between the outreach youth worker and the young people involved. This report:

- presents the process toolkit that was used, across the whole COSY project, to determine what qualifies as a local community safety signal (identical to the toolkit applied in the other WP1-8 reports, reproduced here for completeness);
- describes the ecosystem context of Amsterdam New-West, including the outreach youth work organizations engaged to facilitate contact with specific target groups;
- describes the shared, relationship-based approach used across the four WP8 activities;
- documents the four activities organized for WP8 (context, approach, participants), each separately numbered on the same template, together with the signals identified during each activity;
- provides a consolidated, cross-activity overview of the signals and the local context in which they occur.

This report constitutes the underlying material for WP8 deliverable D1-8.2 ("Method(s) to determine what a local community signal is", shared with WP1-8) and for the WP8 monitoring & evaluation report (D1-8.3).

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. This toolkit informed the design and interpretation of the WP8 fieldwork in Amsterdam New-West. 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 young people. To structure the exploration of these signals, the toolkit works with a fixed list of 14 life domains, including education, police, justice, wellbeing, mobility, social media, gender, leisure and public space, among others.

Four working principles apply throughout: voluntary participation, a safe conversational environment, confidentiality, and the leadership of youth voice.

2.2 Decision tree “Is it a local community safety signal?”

Every observation raised by youth or 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. The WP8 signals presented per activity below already reflect an initial level of this filtering: they were clustered by the youth workers around themes that recurred across several young people within each conversation.

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.

2.5 Signal Prioritization Matrix

Finally, once validated and scored, signals will be 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 response strategies: Monitor, Advocacy or policy dialogue, Quick community improvements, and Immediate pilot action. This matrix will guide the prioritization of WP8 signals for Phase 2 (bonding and bridging with policy-makers and representatives of government institutions) and Phase 3 (co-production) of COSY.

3. Ecosystem context: Amsterdam New-West

Amsterdam New-West forms a relevant context for research into safety and connectedness among young people. The borough originated as part of Amsterdam's post-war expansion districts and has long been characterized by significant cultural, social and economic diversity. Residents with a wide range of backgrounds, migration histories and lived realities shape an urban environment in which different perspectives on coexistence, identity, participation and citizenship come together.

For young people, this context forms an important environment within which they develop their relationship to the neighborhood, school, institutions and society. Feelings of safety and belonging are thereby shaped not only by physical safety, but also by experienced recognition, inclusion, and access to (or exclusion from) societal opportunities.

In Amsterdam New-West, the strengthening of liveability, safety and equal opportunity is supported by long-term area-based programmes. The National Programme Samen Nieuw-West ("Together New-West") and efforts under the National Programme for Liveability and Safety focus on themes such as education, work, housing, safety, democratic engagement and opportunities for young people. Within this approach, young people's position is explicitly seen as part of the borough's future.

In recent years, a clear development has also become visible in which young people are increasingly involved as active partners in the development of their neighborhood. One example is the Youth Core Group (Kerngroep Jongeren) of the National Programme Samen Nieuw-West, in which young people themselves think along about issues in the borough and develop proposals to improve their living environment. This reflects an early, cautious shift from policy for young people toward policy with young people.

Within safety policy too, an increasingly explicit connection is made between safety, perspective, equal opportunity and societal participation. Borough policy documents emphasize that feelings of exclusion, limited opportunity and a lack of future perspective can affect how young people relate to society. Safety is therefore approached not only from an enforcement perspective, but also from prevention, talent development and strengthening societal participation.

For the COSY project, Amsterdam New-West therefore offers a context in which questions of safety, connectedness and participation are closely tied to equal opportunity, societal recognition, and young people's active involvement in the development of their neighborhood and community.

3.1 Demographic and socio-economic profile

Amsterdam New-West is one of the largest and most diverse boroughs of the city, with just over 168,000 inhabitants (2026) the largest borough of Amsterdam by population. It comprises several areas and neighborhoods largely originating from the Western Garden Cities, including Sloterveer, Geuzenveld, Osdorp, Slotervaart, Overtoomse Veld, De Aker, Nieuw Sloten and Oostoever Sloterveer, themselves further divided into dozens of smaller neighborhoods.

New-West has a relatively young population: 19% is aged 0–17, 16% is aged 18–26, 53% is aged 27–65, and 12% is 66 or older — meaning relatively more children and young people live in New-West compared with the Amsterdam average.

New-West is known as one of the most multicultural boroughs of the Netherlands, with large groups of residents tracing their roots to Morocco, Turkey, Suriname, the Dutch Antilles, Ghana, Pakistan, Syria and various Eastern European countries. In several neighborhoods, a majority of residents have a migration background. This diversity contributes to a rich social and cultural life, while also requiring attention to inclusion, language development and equal opportunity.

New-West differs from the Amsterdam average on several socio-economic indicators: approximately 28% of residents fall into the low socio-economic status category; the share of households on a minimum income was

around 18–19%; social cohesion is rated lower than in many other boroughs; and overall wellbeing levels sit below the Amsterdam average.

3.2 Key social challenges

- Poverty and financial insecurity: many households struggle to make ends meet, with poverty relatively common, particularly among families with children — creating risks of debt, health problems and limited development opportunities.
- Unequal opportunities among youth: children and young people more often grow up in lower-income families, which researchers link to higher risk of early school leaving, underuse of talent, fewer labor-market opportunities, lower sports participation, and health disadvantages.
- Housing and housing quality: New-West faces a substantial restructuring challenge, including demolition and new-build, housing shortages, pressure on social rental housing, displacement and relocation stress for residents, and overcrowding in some households.
- Liveability and safety: several neighborhoods have long faced issues such as litter, nuisance, feelings of unsafety, tensions between resident groups, and youth crime and undermining criminality in some areas. Around one in three residents reports sometimes feeling unsafe in their own neighborhood.
- Concentration of vulnerability: New-West has a relatively high concentration of residents facing poverty, health problems, debt, unemployment and mental health difficulties simultaneously, meaning problems can compound within families and neighborhoods.
- Social mobility: research shows social mobility in New-West lags behind other parts of Amsterdam, and young people who become socially successful more often leave the borough.

Alongside these challenges, New-West has significant strengths: great cultural diversity, strong neighborhood networks, considerable civic initiative, relatively abundant green space (Sloterpark, Sloterplass), youth entrepreneurship, and active social work and resident-led initiatives.

3.3 Outreach youth work organizations engaged

Contact with specific target groups for WP8 was facilitated through the following outreach youth work organizations active in New-West:

- ONE jongerenwerk (Be OK, Combiwel, IMD): youth work in New-West is delivered by the organizations Be OK, Combiwel and IMD, which were brought together under a single banner — ONE jongerenwerk — following a six-year tendering process. There are some differences in specific expertise between the three, but in general all three can be expected to work according to the same methodology. The main difference lies in geography: before the tender, each organization operated in different neighborhoods across New-West; they now share youth centers, although most staff still tend to work primarily within their original neighborhood.
- VIA (PerMens): VIA stands for "Verbindende Integrale Aanpak" (Connecting Integrated Approach). It is a connecting approach because VIA support workers know the neighborhoods and the city well and work together with other organizations, such as the neighborhoods teams and the youth points. "Integrated" means VIA support workers look at all areas of a young person's life, rather than only the one area that is not going well. VIA is also an outreach approach: VIA support workers take the initiative themselves to seek out and support young people.

Youth work in New-West predominantly reaches young people from families with a migration history (particularly Moroccan or Turkish background). Demand for youth work is largely oriented around equal opportunity and talent development, seen through the lens of keeping public space safe and liveable — for

example, challenges around nuisance-causing youth, young people present in public space frequently and until late, and friction between younger residents and older residents. Youth work seeks to coach young people on these dynamics, while also playing a bridging role toward policymakers and adult residents.

4. Approach across the four WP8 activities

Rather than following a single, centrally designed session format, the four WP8 activities in Amsterdam New-West each built on an existing, trusted relationship between an outreach youth worker and a specific group of young people, using a low-threshold, informal setting suited to that group. Across the four activities, several shared elements can be identified:

- Existing trust as the entry point: three of the four activities (WP8.1, WP8.3 and WP8.4) explicitly built on young people the youth worker already knew and supported or met directly during an outreach round; WP8.2 similarly took place within an established youth work relationship.
- Informal, everyday settings: activities took the form of an existing girls' group conversation, a written reflection format, a shared pizza dinner, and tea at a nearby youth center after an ambulant street-work encounter — rather than a formal, structured research session.
- Open, exploratory questioning: rather than a fixed questionnaire, conversations were structured around a small number of open prompts (e.g. what does safety mean to you; when do you feel unsafe; who do you think feels most unsafe), allowing young people to define safety in their own terms and follow the conversation into unplanned directions.
- Attention to what makes others feel safe, not only oneself: several activities explicitly asked young people to reflect on their own impact on other people's sense of safety (e.g. towards women, younger relatives, or peers from different backgrounds), producing signals about protective behavior and awareness alongside signals about risk.

As in other COSY ecosystems, this relationship-based, low-threshold approach made it possible to reach young people who might not otherwise take part in a formal participation moment, and to surface signals with a degree of nuance and self-reflection that a more structured format might not have captured.

5. Activities organized for WP8 in the ecosystem of Amsterdam New-West

Four activities were organised with young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally in Amsterdam New-West to realise OO1.1. They are reported separately below, numbered WP8.1 through WP8.4.

Event	Date	Location	Format	Participants
WP8.1	18/06/2026	Amsterdam New-West — existing girls' group setting	Facilitated group conversation on girls' safety (existing group)	13 (13 girls); 1 country
WP8.2	01/07/2026	Amsterdam New-West — existing youth work setting	Reflective conversation on safety (open prompts, written up per theme)	4 (4 boys); 1 country

WP8.3	09/07/2026	Amsterdam New-West — youth worker's own setting (pizza dinner)	Informal group conversation over dinner (existing relationship)	5 (4 boys, 1 girl), around age 15; 1 country
WP8.4	10/07/2026	Amsterdam New-West — nearby youth center (following an ambulant round)	Informal group conversation over tea, following ambulant street-work contact	3 (2 boys, 1 girl); 1 country

WP8.1: Girls' safety conversation, Amsterdam New-West

Description

A conversation on girls' safety in Amsterdam New-West was held on 18 June 2026 with an existing group of 13 girls. The conversation covered several themes raised by the participants themselves: interactions with boys and men in public space, romantic relationships, attitudes toward physical violence between genders, family dynamics, and independent travel and autonomy.

The conversation showed that participants draw a clear distinction between behavior they find annoying or provocative and behavior that actually makes them feel unsafe: catcalling by groups of boys their own age was explicitly named as the former, while the unpredictable behavior of older men in public space was named as the latter.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety signal/ observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Street harassment (catcalling) by groups of boys aged 14–20	Gender / Public space / Other: social dynamics	Girls report boys in street groups sometimes calling out to them; the shared coping strategy is to ignore this completely ("better to act like you don't hear them, just don't give them attention"). Some girls sometimes respond or give a dismissive look, which occasionally makes the boys angrier (shifting from flirting to name-calling) but sometimes causes them to stop. Participants explicitly stated that this behavior does not make them feel unsafe — it remains at the level of provocation and does not make them feel unsafe.
Unpredictable behavior of older men (40+) living on the street or under the influence of alcohol or hard drugs	Public space/ Wellbeing	In contrast to peer catcalling, this is what genuinely creates unsafe feelings: men who are homeless or visibly under the influence of alcohol or hard drugs are described as shouting at them and behaving unpredictably; girls fear these men might do something to them. Several concrete

		locations in the neighborhoods are consciously avoided for this reason, e.g. the underpass at Lidewijdepad 52 in the Kolenkitbuurt.
Feeling safe through an exclusive, caring romantic relationship	Gender / Wellbeing / Other: social dynamics (protective)	Participants associate feeling safe with having a boyfriend who looks after them and does not maintain relationships with other girls ("is only there for them"); framed as a positive/protective factor rather than a risk.
Divergent norms on physical violence between boys and girls	Gender/ Other: social dynamics	Discussion on whether it is acceptable for a boy to hit a girl. Most participants held that a boy should never touch a girl regardless of what she did; two participants took the view that it depends on what the girl did, and that in some cases it can be self-defense. Recorded here as a divergence in normative views on gender-based violence rather than a single confirmed signal.
Fear of upsetting or angering their mother; protective role of brothers	Wellbeing / Other: social dynamics (protective)	Most participants said they are afraid of their mother and do not want to hurt or anger her; of the participants discussing this specifically, most reported a better relationship with their mother than their father, and no one reported being afraid of their father. Brothers were described as a protective presence, e.g. shielding them from parents if they come home later than agreed.

Additional observation (not treated as a safety signal): the group also held an extended discussion on whether it is acceptable for a 16-year-old girl to travel alone to Spain to spend an unsupervised holiday with her grandparents (without her parents present). This produced a genuine values debate without a clear consensus — most participants said they personally would not send their own future child on such a trip alone, while at the same time supporting the specific girl in the group who was considering it. This is recorded as a generational/parental-autonomy discussion rather than a safety risk signal.

Photo



WP8.2: Reflective safety conversation with a group of boys, Amsterdam New-West

Description

On 1 July 2026, a reflective conversation on safety was held with a group of 4 boys already known to the youth worker. The conversation was structured around several open prompts: what safety means, moments in which they do not feel safe, their own effect on other people's sense of safety, who they think feels most unsafe, and what they would change about safety in their area.

The resulting material is written up thematically per prompt below; the illustrative statements are combined with observations from the group rather than attributed to a single named individual.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety signal/ observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Mixed trust in the police as a safety guarantor	Police	Safety is associated with the idea that "the police should be there for your safety", but participants express uncertainty about whether this holds in practice; one participant noted personally never having experienced this directly, except once witnessing police helping a woman stuck on her balcony.
Self-defense and respect as personal safety resources	Wellbeing/ Other: social dynamics	Being able to fight or defend oneself is named as good for one's own safety; respect is named as something that creates a safe environment when present.

Tense encounter with an unpredictable person under the influence ("junkie")	Public space/ Wellbeing	One participant describes feeling unsafe after a person shouted at and threatened to hit a colleague, requiring the participant to push the person outside.
Feeling unsafe from loss of control in an encounter with authority	Police/ Justice	One participant describes being stopped by police while in Morocco, not understanding what they wanted, and feeling unsafe due to the perceived unpredictability of the officers involved, despite not having done anything wrong.
Tense confrontation to recover stolen property	Public space	One participant describes the tension of confronting, at night in a park, the person believed to have stolen from him, to try to get the item back.
Fear and flight from an erratic person under the influence at night	Public space/ Wellbeing	One participant describes being frightened and running away after encountering a person with visibly dilated eyes shouting at him at night near Slotermeer, on the way to his moped.
Self-awareness of one's own impact on others' (women's) sense of safety	Gender / Public space / Other: social dynamics	One participant describes noticing that others, e.g. a woman walking ahead of him on the same route at night, may feel unsafe because of his presence, and responding by overtaking her quickly while looking friendly, to reduce her discomfort — described as a deliberate, respectful behavior.
Perception that women and people outside the norm feel most unsafe	Gender / Other: social dynamics (incl. LGBTQ+)	Participants perceive women as most likely to feel unsafe, due to vulnerability; people who fall outside accepted norms and are not left alone or seen as "normal" — explicitly including lesbian and gay people — are also named as feeling unsafe. One participant notes not feeling generally responsible for others' safety (seeing this as the police's task) but feeling more responsible specifically where women are concerned.
Suggested local safety priorities named by participants	Public space / Police / Other: race-ethnicity	When asked what they would change about safety, participants named: addressing homelessness/rough sleeping ("tackling people living on the street"), addressing ethnic profiling,

and preventing people from getting into trouble/problems more generally.

Photo



WP8.3: Pizza dinner conversation with a group of young people, Amsterdam New-West

Description

On the evening of 9 July 2026, the outreach youth worker shared a pizza dinner with a group of 5 young people around age 15 (4 boys, 1 girl) already known to and supported by the youth worker through their regular youth work and discussed their sense of safety in Amsterdam New-West.

Participants initially framed safety mainly in terms of being able to protect oneself, and gave examples suggesting they never feel unsafe, presenting themselves as tough. With further gentle probing by the youth worker, participants acknowledged feeling safest specifically in their own neighborhood, becoming noticeably more alert and watchful of who is around — and whether they recognize them — as soon as they are in an unfamiliar neighborhood.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety signal/ observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Initial self-presentation as never feeling unsafe, followed by more nuanced disclosure	Wellbeing/ Other: social dynamics	Participants first described safety mainly as an ability to protect oneself and denied ever feeling unsafe ("because they're tough"); this shifted with further conversation to a more specific and nuanced picture (see below).

Own neighborhood as the primary safe zone; heightened vigilance elsewhere	Public space/ Wellbeing	Participants feel safest in their own neighborhood; as soon as they are in a different neighborhood they are described as much more on guard, paying closer attention to who is present and whether those people are known to them.
Protecting female family members as a personal priority	Gender/ Other: social dynamics (protective)	Participants find it important to make other people feel safe, referring specifically to female family members — mother, (younger) sister, aunt or grandmother.
The youth/community center as a distinctly safe, low-threshold space	Leisure/ Public space/ Wellbeing	The community center they attend weekly for activities is named as a safe place where they can be themselves and do what they want; this is contrasted with other settings where they must share space with other young people from the neighborhood and the atmosphere is different.

Photo



WP8.4: Outreach conversation over tea with a small group of young people, Amsterdam New-West

Description

On 10 July 2026, the outreach youth worker encountered a small group of 3 young people (2 boys, 1 girl) on the street during an ambulant round and invited them for tea at a nearby youth center in New-West. These young people expressed a range of perspectives on safety, several relating to nightlife and self-expression. The conversation covered going out and dancing as spaces for self-expression and identity, unequal treatment at nightlife venue entrances, and substance-use choices, and closed with a reflection on risk, excitement and over-regulation in the Netherlands more broadly.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety signal/ observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Going out and dancing as spaces to feel able to be oneself	Leisure/ Wellbeing	Participants named the feeling of being able to be themselves while going out and dancing as an important part of what safety/comfort means to them.
Unequal treatment of friends of color at nightlife venue entrances	Other: race-ethnicity / Leisure / Public space	Participants report noticing that they themselves are let into venues while friends of color are less readily admitted; one specific incident is described in which a participant was refused entry because he was carrying a shoulder bag. Participants believe door staff sometimes invent rules that should not exist.
Reflective, harm-aware substance-use choices among peers	Wellbeing / Health / Other: social dynamics	One participant described having stopped using THC vapes because of their strong, disorienting effect on her (describing them as very potent and disorienting), while continuing to use plant-form cannabis and non-THC vapes. Recorded here as a youth-reported harm perception rather than project guidance on substance use.
Reflection on risk, excitement and perceived over-regulation	Leisure/ Other: social dynamics	Participants try to approach people on nights out in a way that feels comfortable for everyone, while viewing a degree of "edginess"/testing boundaries as part of the fun of going out; they noted that a fully risk-free environment would be "boring" and view the Netherlands as a country that can afford to have everything regulated "down to the last detail" — which they also find rather dull.

6. Consolidated overview of identified signals and context

Together, the four WP8 activities engaged 25 young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally (9 male, 16 female — noting WP8.1's 13 girls make up the majority of this total) connected to the Amsterdam

New-West ecosystem, reached through existing, trusted relationships with outreach youth workers across four different, informal settings. The table below consolidates the recurring themes across the four activities, to support subsequent decision-tree validation and Safety Signal Assessment Framework scoring at project-staff level.

Recurring theme	Raised in	Cross-activity observation
Unpredictable adults using substances / living on the street in public space	WP8.1, WP8.2	The single most consistent unsafe-feeling trigger across activities with different genders and ages: both girls (WP8.1) and boys (WP8.2) independently describe unpredictable, sometimes threatening behavior by adults who are homeless or under the influence as what actually makes them feel unsafe — distinct from peer-to-peer provocation, which is not described as unsafe.
Own neighborhood as the safe zone; heightened vigilance elsewhere	WP8.3 (explicit); echoed in WP8.1's avoided locations and WP8.2's caution around unfamiliar authority	Familiarity with people and place is repeatedly the deciding factor in feeling safe, consistent with the pattern documented in other COSY ecosystems.
Protecting female family members / awareness of one's own impact on women's safety	WP8.1, WP8.2, WP8.3	A strikingly consistent, cross-activity, self-reported protective orientation: boys in two separate activities (WP8.2, WP8.3) spontaneously named protecting or being mindful of women and girls (family members or strangers) as important to them, while girls in WP8.1 named male family members (brothers) as protective figures — together suggesting gendered protection norms are a strong, shared cultural reference point in this ecosystem.
Police / authority: valued in principle, distrusted or feared in practice	WP8.1 (implicitly, via avoided locations), WP8.2	Boys in WP8.2 explicitly named the police as something that "should" provide safety while expressing scepticism about whether it does so in practice, and one participant separately described a frightening, unpredictable police encounter

		abroad; suggested local priorities included addressing ethnic profiling.	
Youth/community centers as distinctly safe, low-threshold spaces	WP8.3	The community center is explicitly named as a place of freedom and belonging, contrasted with other shared youth spaces where the atmosphere differs — echoing similar signals about the protective value of trusted youth-work spaces documented in other WP's.	
Vulnerability of people outside accepted social norms	WP8.2	Boys explicitly named women, and people who fall outside accepted norms — including specifically lesbian and gay people — as those they believe feel most unsafe, an insight not raised in the other three WP8 activities but worth cross-referencing with the gender-related signals from other ecosystems.	
Unequal treatment linked to ethnicity/appearance in public and leisure settings	WP8.2 (ethnic profiling), WP8.4 (nightlife door policies)	A recurring but setting-specific pattern: WP8.2 names ethnic profiling by police/enforcement as a priority to address, while WP8.4 independently names unequal treatment by nightlife door staff toward friends of color, echoing discrimination-related signals raised in other WP's.	
Peer-level provocation (street harassment, boundary-testing on nights out) as distinct from feeling unsafe	WP8.1, WP8.4	Girls in WP8.1 explicitly distinguish catcalling by peer-age boys from genuine unsafety, and young people in WP8.4 frame a degree of "edginess" during nights out as enjoyable rather than risky — together suggesting this ecosystem's young people draw a clear, self-aware line between provocation/excitement and actual perceived danger.	
Gender-based violence norms	WP8.1	A notable internal divergence within a single activity: most girls held that a boy should never hit a girl regardless of circumstance, while two	

		participants qualified this with reference to the girl's own behavior or self-defense — a nuance worth further, careful exploration rather than treating the group's view as uniform.	
--	--	--	--

6.1 Context of the four activities within the Amsterdam New-West ecosystem

The four WP8 activities intentionally combined different entry points into the same ecosystem: a facilitated conversation with an existing girls' group (WP8.1); a reflective conversation with a group of boys already known to the youth worker, structured around open prompts (WP8.2); an informal dinner conversation with younger adolescents from the youth worker's regular caseload (WP8.3); and a spontaneous outreach encounter converted into a tea conversation with a small mixed-gender group (WP8.4). This combination reflects the outreach youth work landscape described in Section 3.3 — delivered through ONE jongerenwerk (Be OK, Combiwel, IMD) and VIA/PerMens's outreach approach — and reaches, consistent with that landscape, predominantly young people from families with a Moroccan or Turkish migration background.

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 organisers and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union.