

**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:	WP4
Event name:	Local community safety signals of young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally in Grammont
Type:	Training
In situ/online:	In situ
Location:	Belgium 1. Groen Kruiske, Denderstraat 13, 9500 Geraardsbergen 2. Groen Kruiske, Denderstraat 13, 9500 Geraardsbergen 3. JC De Spiraal, Zakkaai 29, 9500 Geraardsbergen
Date(s):	1. 15/05/2026 2. 18/08/2026 3. 25/08/2026
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.uitdemarge.be/cosy/
Participants	
Female:	1. 5 2. 1 3. 4
Male:	1. 2 2. 11 3. 1
Non-binary:	1. 0 2. 0 3. 1
From country 1 [name]:	Belgium
...	
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 4 (WP4) of the COSY project — "Local community safety signals of young people in the municipality of Grammont 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, WP4 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. Three activities were organized in the Grammont ecosystem to this end, each building on the trusted relationship between local youth development workers (notably Evelien and Admir) and young people in the municipality. This report:

- presents the process toolkit that was used, across the whole COSY project, to determine what qualifies as a local community safety signal;
- documents the three activities organized for WP4 (context, approach, participants);
- provides a consolidated overview of the signals that were captured during these three activities, and the local context in which they occur.

This report constitutes the underlying material for WP4 deliverable D1-8.2 ("Method(s) to determine what a local community signal is") and for the WP4 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 was applied by the activity organizer during the preparation, facilitation and post-processing of all three WP4 activities in Grammont. 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: (1) health, (2) housing, (3) information, (4) justice, (5) mobility, (6) education, (7) public space, (8) police, (9) social media, (10) sport, (11) leisure, (12) wellbeing, (13) gender, and (14) other.

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.

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. The facilitator notes also include a short sketch of the target group present (age, gender, ethnic-cultural background, interests, needs, and living context) and a table to log positive and negative testimonies about contacts with societal institutions.

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 — how often does it occur (from less than once a month to multiple times a day)?
- Impact — how strongly does it affect young people's physical or mental well-being?
- Spread — how many youth groups are affected?
- Urgency — will it worsen without immediate action?
- Change potential — to what extent can local actors influence it?

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, validated 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 response strategies: Monitor (low impact / low ability to act), Advocacy or policy dialogue (high impact / low ability to act), Quick community

improvements (low impact / high ability to act), and Immediate pilot action (high impact / high ability to act). This matrix will guide the prioritization of signals for Phase 2 (bonding and bridging with policymakers and representatives of government institutions) and Phase 3 (co-production) of COSY.

3. Activities organized for WP4 in the ecosystem of Grammont

Three activities were organized with young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally in the Grammont ecosystem to realize OO1.1. All three built on the trusted relationship between youth development workers in Grammont (notably youth workers Evelien and Admir) and young people in the municipality. They are reported separately below, numbered WP4.1 through WP4.3.

Event	Date	Location	Format	Participants
WP4.1	15/05/2026	Grammont	Post-it exercise per theme + neighborhood mapping	7 (2 male, 5 female); 1 country
WP4.2	18/08/2026	Grammont	Barbecue with structured questions ("earn your meal")	12 (11 male, 1 female); 1 country
WP4.3	25/08/2026	Grammont — near "De Spiraal"	Graffiti workshop with facilitated conversation	6 (1 male, 4 female, 1 non-binary); 1 country

WP4.1: Post-it signal-gathering exercise, Grammont

Description

Seven young people took part in this first WP4 activity, organized by youth development work in Grammont. The activity used a post-it exercise: participants were given post-its and could freely note down what concerned them, bundled by theme (e.g. social media, sport, education, police, mobility, wellbeing, public space). While writing, participants discussed and reacted to what others had already written and stuck up, so that the exercise combined individual reflection with group conversation.

To help clarify what could be written on the post-its, an example from the same exercise as previously used in youth development work Menen was shown for each theme.

The activity closed with a reflection on the different neighborhoods where participants like, or would rather not, spend time, distinguishing positive and negative neighborhoods/locations from their own perspective.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety Signal (raw observation)	Frequency of mention	Life domain(s)	Context/ example
---------------------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------

Harmful influence of AI-generated content on social media		Social media/ Gender	Children are described as being heavily influenced by AI-generated videos, including sexualized content and content reinforcing gender role patterns.	
Misinformation and fake profiles online		Social media/ Information	A lot of fake news and fake profiles circulate online; not all young people handle this critically or safely.	
Inadequate sports infrastructure		Sport/ Public space	Participants asked for a better football pitch; some squares are difficult to use for sport during the day because families with young children are present, and participants suggested these squares would be better suited for sport from 22:00 onward.	
Need for more public exercise facilities		Sport/ Public space	Participants expressed a need for more opportunities to train in public space, for example a pull-up station.	
Opposition to national education policy reform		Education	Participants explicitly named Minister Zuhal Demir and her education reforms in negative terms ("get rid of Zuhal Demir").	
Costly mandatory school trips		Education	School trips that are compulsory are perceived as too expensive.	
Segregation among peer groups at school		Education/ Other: social dynamics	During breaks, young people end up separated into distinct groups: "the junkies", "the foreigners" and "the Belgians".	
Racist and disproportionate policing		Police/ Other: race	Some officers are described as racist; participants report being stopped up to three times in one evening because of their skin color, a pattern they do not see happening to white young people.	

Low trust in police among girls facing harassment		Police/ Gender/ Public space	Young girls who feel uncomfortable due to the presence of older men in public space do not feel they have enough trust in the police to report this.	
Racism and discrimination on public transport		Mobility/ Other: race	Reported both from other passengers and from transport staff.	
Unsafety for girls travelling alone on public transport		Mobility/ Gender	Often felt unsafe by young girls travelling alone, linked to earlier experiences with men who intimidate or seek unwanted contact.	
Intimidation of girls by older men in public space and on transport		Wellbeing/ Gender/ Public space	Girls frequently feel intimidated by older men, both in public space and on public transport.	
Lack of safe places to go when feeling unsafe		Wellbeing/ Public space	Participants (both boys and girls) express a need for places they can go to when they feel unsafe in public space.	
Discrimination in access to holiday and weekend jobs		Work/ Wellbeing/ Other: race	Participants report mental strain from discrimination when looking for a holiday job or weekend work because of their skin color; one participant recalled being told explicitly that they would unfortunately not be accepted because of their skin color.	
Insufficient street lighting		Public space	Participants asked for more street lighting.	
Insufficient camera surveillance		Public space	Participants asked for more cameras in public space.	
Lack of shelter from rain		Public space	Participants asked for more canopies/shelters to take cover when it rains.	

Lack of play space for younger children and hangout space for young people		Public space	Participants asked for more playgrounds for children, noting this would also allow young people themselves to "chill" on a square.
Sexual harassment of a minor in public space		Gender/ Public space	One participant, describing herself as "a 14-year-old girl", reported being whistled at, honked at from a car, and followed by two men aged 20–30, and stated that this happens very often.
Vacant and abandoned areas associated with drugs and vandalism		Public space/ Other: crimes & felonies	Participants pointed to significant vacancy and abandoned spaces where activities they want nothing to do with take place — drugs, mess, and vandalism ("breaking everything").

Additional observation — positive and negative neighborhoods: Participants were also asked to name neighborhoods or places where they feel good (their favourite place) and where they have had negative experiences. Positive neighborhoods/places named: De Spiraal, "de Chille plek" (the chill spot), Maretak, and Plage. Negative neighborhoods/places named: Abdij, and — notably — Plage was named in both categories, indicating that experiences of this specific location vary depending on who else is present, a nuance also echoed in WP4.2 below.

Photo



WP4.2: Barbecue signal-gathering activity, Grammont

Description

Twelve young people took part in this second WP4 activity, organized as a barbecue. Young people were welcome to take part in the barbecue; before or during the meal, several questions were asked which participants answered to "earn" their meal. Six structured questions were used: favorite place in the city; least favorite place and why; main free-time activities; what the city needs more of for young people; whether they ever feel unsafe in the city; and who they can turn to with problems, for a chat, or for advice.

Beyond the six structured questions, several additional, spontaneous points came up during the activity and are reported separately below as extra input.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety Signal (raw observation)	Frequency of mention	Life domain(s)	Context/ example
Named favorite places provide leisure, meeting space and a sense of safety		Leisure/ Public space/ Wellbeing	Places named: Plage, the stadium, the library, Belchicken, Maretak, the youth center, Overkop, De Spiraal, De Muur, Stationsplein, and the market. Participants indicated these places offer a good way to fill their free time, room to meet up, facilities such as wifi, people to talk to, and that these places feel safe.
Certain places are avoided depending on who is present or the time of day		Public space/ Wellbeing	Least favorite places named: Plage (depending on who is present); the Abdij (especially at night); school (no trust in teachers); and the station/station bicycle shed (young people are often bothered there by adults).
Free time is mainly spent on sport, gaming, socializing and volunteering		Leisure/ Sport/ Other: social dynamics	Main free-time activities named: sport (football and training), PlayStation (at Overkop or De Chille Plek), working on cars, hanging out with friends, eating together with friends, and going to the youth center — including taking on an active role there as a volunteer.
Need for better sports facilities, more activities		Sport/ Leisure Public space /	Participants asked for: better squares to do sport on; clearly marked-out football pitches; more

and more trusted youth workers		Other: social dynamics	activities for young people to take part in; more events in the city (winter is described as a "dead period" for young people in Grammont); and more people like Admir and Evelien (i.e. more youth development workers/trusted figures).
Racism experienced at the market		Other: race/ Public space	Named directly as a source of feeling unsafe in the city.
Improved but still present unsafety linked to police		Police	Participants indicated they still sometimes feel unsafe because of the police, although this is already better than a few years ago.
Discomfort walking outside at night		Public space/ Wellbeing	Several participants indicated they do not feel at ease walking on the street at night.
Threats and being followed by adults in public space		Public space/ Wellbeing	A specific situation was reported in which three 14-year-olds were followed by an adult man carrying a machete.
Being bothered by intoxicated adults in public space		Public space/ Wellbeing	Participants report a considerable number of drunk people in public space who bother them.
Trusted figures and services young people turn to		Other: social dynamics/ Wellbeing (protective)	When asked who they can turn to with problems, for a chat, or for advice, participants named: friends; Admir or Evelien; Overkop; police officer Aaron; and the youth service.

Additional observations — extra input beyond the six structured questions: Several further points emerged spontaneously during the activity: (1) discrimination or bullying by train conductors is sometimes experienced on public transport; (2) some young people must repeatedly wait for a residence permit, which is renewed only for short periods each time, creating ongoing uncertainty; (3) participants recalled a history of tension and fights (organized with a "points system") with young people from Ninove, Denderleeuw, Dendermonde and Zottegem, which made it easy for a young person from Grammont to get into trouble with peers when visiting those cities — participants noted this has improved compared to the past; (4) young people expressed a wish

for more shared activities such as going on camp together, and indicated they would like to take an active role themselves in organizing this (fundraising, planning, etc.); and (5) racism was also reported from professionals working across various municipal services, not only from peers or members of the public.

Photos



WP4.3: Graffiti workshop and facilitated conversation, Grammont

Description

This third WP4 activity grew out of a shared interest in drawing among a small group of young people who may, soon, paint a mural on the wall at De Spiraal. Evelien of youth development work in Grammont was aware that the facilitator does graffiti, and this connection led to the organization of a graffiti workshop. The facilitator taught participants some basic graffiti techniques, after which they were free to spray on a large black plastic sheet. Graffiti functioned as the means, with safety-signal capture as the underlying goal: as participants added elements to the sheet, the facilitator engaged them in conversation about what they were drawing and why, using each image as a natural entry point into a conversation about safety.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety Signal (raw observation)	Frequency of mention	Life domain(s)	Context / example
Unsafety while walking alone in public space		Public space/ Gender/ Wellbeing	A participant sprayed "Spiderman" on the sheet, explaining that a figure like Spiderman would be needed in Grammont, since many young people are bothered by

			older men or by other young people while out and about.	
Being targeted by police due to a past offence		Police/ Justice	A participant sprayed a cannabis leaf on the sheet. He explained that after once being caught with a joint, police now stop and check him whenever they come across him. He considers this unfair, since friends from the Chiro (a Belgian youth movement) and many young people from the youth center also use cannabis but are never checked.	
Insufficient infrastructure to pursue hobbies, and gendered exclusion in doing so		Sport/ Public space/ Gender/ Other: social dynamics	A participant sprayed a skateboard. A girl in the group described starting skateboarding as difficult at first because she was the only girl doing it, and recalled being laughed at by other girls for being seen as "boyish". She indicated a need for much more and better skating infrastructure in the area.	
Discrimination and pressure to conform		Other: race/ Other: social dynamics	Many different colors appeared on the sheet. Participants said they found this beautiful and expressed a wish that the whole world could be more colorful; currently, they feel everyone has to "stay within the lines", and that being a little different results in being judged for it.	
Need for more trusted figures and safe spaces		Wellbeing/ Other: social dynamics (protective)	One participant sprayed the Hulk, which the facilitator used as a bridge to talk about trusted figures. Participants indicated they greatly value having Evelien available to them as a trusted figure, someone with whom they can have conversations they cannot have with family or friends. They expressed a need for more trusted figures and safe spaces in the city.	

Desire for more varied leisure activities and outings		Leisure	Participants said they would like more outings in their free time, such as visiting different skateparks. As a direct result of this conversation, the facilitator arranged with the group and Evelien to organize a graffiti workshop at a skatepark in the facilitator's own municipality in the near future.	
---	--	---------	---	--

Photo



4. Consolidated overview of identified signals and context

Together, the three WP4 activities engaged 25 young people at risk of being excluded by society/institutionally (14 male, 10 female, 1 non-binary) in Grammont, reached through three complementary formats — a post-it/theme-based exercise, a barbecue with structured questions, and a graffiti workshop using created imagery as a conversation starter. The table below consolidates the raw observations captured across all three activities per COSY life domain.

Life domain	Signals raised in	Cross-activity observation
Police	WP4.1, WP4.2, WP4.3	Ethnic profiling and disproportionate/repeated checks are raised independently in all three activities: WP4.1 documents a girl or young person being stopped three times in one evening due to skin color, WP4.2 notes lingering (if improved)

		unsafety linked to police, and WP4.3 documents a young person being repeatedly stopped and checked following a single past cannabis-related offence, while peers who use cannabis without a record are never checked.	
Gender/ public space	WP4.1, WP4.2, WP4.3	The most consistently and severely documented theme in this dataset: WP4.1 records a first-hand account of a 14-year-old girl being whistled at, honked at, and followed by two adult men; WP4.2 documents three 14-year-olds followed by an armed adult; WP4.3 documents a girl facing social exclusion (being laughed at, called "boyish") for skateboarding — together showing that public space is experienced as gendered and unsafe across multiple, independently confirmed situations.	
Other: race/ discrimination	WP4.1, WP4.2, WP4.3	Raised in every activity and across multiple institutional settings: policing (WP4.1, WP4.3), public transport and holiday-job access (WP4.1), the market and municipal services (WP4.2), and, in WP4.3, framed more broadly by young people themselves as a wish for a more "colorful" world where being different is not penalized.	
Education	WP4.1, WP4.2	WP4.1 documents explicit opposition to a national education policy reform (Minister Zuhale Demir) and peer segregation during breaks ("the junkies, the foreigners, and the Belgians"); WP4.2 documents a specific lack of trust in teachers at one named school.	
Sport/ public space infrastructure	WP4.1, WP4.2, WP4.3	A concrete, actionable and consistently repeated request across all three activities: better/marked football pitches (WP4.1, WP4.2), public	

		exercise equipment (WP4.1), and — specifically for girls — significantly better skating infrastructure (WP4.3).	
Wellbeing / trusted figures	WP4.1, WP4.2, WP4.3	A strong protective factor signal recurring in every activity: young people consistently and independently name specific trusted adults (Evelien, Admir, police officer Aaron) and specific safe spaces (Overkop, the youth center, De Spiraal) as what currently works, while also asking for more of both.	
Public space quality (lighting, shelter, vacancy)	WP4.1, WP4.3	WP4.1 documents concrete infrastructural requests (lighting, shelter from rain, playgrounds) alongside concern about vacant/abandoned areas associated with drugs and vandalism; WP4.3 echoes the same underlying need for safe, well-used public space through the request for more skating infrastructure and outings.	
Mobility	WP4.1, WP4.2	WP4.1 documents discrimination on public transport from both passengers and staff, and gendered unsafety for girls travelling alone; WP4.2 adds a specific instance of discrimination/bullying by train conductors.	
Housing/ residence status	WP4.2	A distinct, single-activity signal not echoed elsewhere in this dataset: repeated short-term renewal of a residence permit, creating ongoing uncertainty for the young people affected.	
Work	WP4.1	Discrimination in access to holiday and weekend jobs based on skin color, including one participant recalling being told explicitly they would not be accepted because of their skin color.	

Other: inter-municipal youth tension (historical)	WP4.2	A historical pattern of organized fights with young people from neighboring towns (Ninove, Denderleeuw, Dendermonde, Zottegem), reported as having improved compared to the past but still shaping how young people from Grammont navigate visits to those municipalities.
---	-------	--

4.1 Recurring patterns across the three activities

- Gendered unsafety in public space is the most severe and consistently confirmed signal in this dataset: independently documented first-hand accounts across all three activities include a 14-year-old girl being followed and harassed by adult men (WP4.1), three 14-year-olds followed by a man carrying a machete (WP4.2), and a girl facing social exclusion for taking up a "boys" hobby (WP4.3).
- Ethnic profiling and disproportionate police attention recur across all three activities, ranging from repeated ID-style checks in one evening (WP4.1) to a young person being permanently flagged and checked following a single past offence, while peers without a record are not (WP4.3) — closely echoing the police-related signals documented directly from youngsters in other COSY ecosystems (e.g. WP1, WP2).
- Discrimination extends well beyond policing into education, transport, retail/market settings, holiday-job access and municipal services, and — notably in WP4.3 — young people themselves frame this not only as a problem to fix but as a positive vision ("the whole world could be more colorful").
- A consistent, cross-activity protective factor is the presence of specific, named trusted adults (Evelien and Admir of youth development work Grammont, and police officer Aaron) and specific safe meeting places (Overkop, the youth centre, De Spiraal, De Chille Plek) — young people explicitly ask for more of both, rather than only naming what is missing.
- Requests for improved sport and public-space infrastructure are the most concrete and consistently actionable signals across all three activities, ranging from marked-out football pitches and public exercise equipment (WP4.1) to specific requests for better skating infrastructure, explicitly linked to enabling girls to take part without social exclusion (WP4.3).
- Some locations (notably "Plage") are named as both a positive and a negative place across different activities, underlining that for young people, a location's safety is often less about the physical place itself and more about who else is present there at a given time.

4.2 Context of the three activities within the Grammont ecosystem

The three WP4 activities intentionally combined different formats to reach and engage young people: a structured, theme-based post-it exercise embedded in an existing youth-work session (WP4.1); a low-threshold barbecue in which participation was linked to a shared meal (WP4.2); and a creative, interest-led graffiti workshop that used the participants' own artistic choices as a natural entry point into conversation about safety (WP4.3). All three activities were made possible through the same trusted local youth work relationship — specifically youth workers Evelien and Admir — who are themselves repeatedly and independently named by participants as a key protective factor in their lives.

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.