

**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:	WP16
Event name:	Local community safety signals of outreach youth workers connected to the capital Amsterdam New-West
Type:	Training
In situ/online:	In situ
Location:	The Netherlands 1. JC The Village, Burgemeester Van Leeuwenlaan 59, 1064 KL Amsterdam 2. Radar Advies, Veemarkt 83, 1019 DB Amsterdam 3. DOCK, J.J. Cremerplein 27A, 1054TH Amsterdam 4. HVO-Querido, Eerste Ringdijkstraat 5, 1097 BC Amsterdam
Date(s):	1. 28/05/2026 2. 02/06/2026 3. 09/07/2026 4. 23/07/2026
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.uitdemarge.be/cosy/
Participants	
Female:	1. 5 2. 2 3. 5 4. 3
Male:	1. 6 2. 2 3. 0 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 16 (WP16) of the COSY project — "Local community safety signals of outreach youth workers connected to the capital Amsterdam New-West" — 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").

Where WP8 gathered signals directly from young people in Amsterdam New-West, WP16 turns to the outreach youth workers and youth development workers who support them, in order to capture both (a) the safety signals these professionals observe among the youngsters they work with, and (b) signals about their own professional practice and working conditions. Four activities were organized in the Amsterdam New-West ecosystem to this end, ranging from a large mixed-gender group session to individually authored, specialized signal write-ups. 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 WP1-16 reports, reproduced here for completeness);
- describes the ecosystem context of Amsterdam New-West, including the outreach youth work organizations engaged;
- describes the varied approach used across the four WP16 activities;
- documents the four activities organized for WP16 (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 WP16 deliverable D9-16.2 ("Method(s) to determine what a local community signal is", shared with WP9-16) and for the WP16 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. This toolkit informed the design and interpretation of the WP16 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. In WP16, this same domain structure was applied to signals youth workers raised about the young people they support; one activity (WP16.4) additionally surfaced a signal concerning youth workers' own sense of safety. Four working principles apply throughout: voluntary participation, a safe conversational environment, confidentiality, and the leadership of youth voice — in WP16, 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 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 WP16 signals presented per activity below already reflect an initial level of this filtering: WP16.1 clusters recurring themes raised across an 11-person group; WP16.2 and WP16.3 explicitly note where the authoring youth worker merged overlapping raw observations into a single consolidated signal, and, in WP16.3, explicitly separate one professional-level observation that does not meet the decision tree's definition of a signal about young people.

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 WP16 signals for Phase 2 (bonding and bridging with policymakers 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 "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 of the National Programme "Together New-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 Slotermeer, Geuzenveld, Osdorp, Slotervaart, Overtoomse Veld, De Aker, Nieuw Sloten and Oostoever Sloterpas, 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 the youth workers who contributed signals to WP16 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 neighborhood and the city well and work together with other organizations, such as the neighborhood 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. VIA workers support young people individually, typically receiving referrals from street-corner-work colleagues for particularly challenging cases — a distinct profile directly reflected in WP16.4 below.

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 in these dynamics, while also playing a bridging role toward policymakers and adult residents.

4. Approach across the four WP16 activities

Rather than following a single, centrally designed session format, the four WP16 activities in Amsterdam New-West each drew on a different professional setting and group size, ranging from a large mixed-gender group session to individually authored signal write-ups by an outreach worker and a dedicated conversation with specialized individual-support workers. Across the four activities, several shared elements can be identified:

- Professional reflection as the entry point: all four activities gathered youth workers' own professional observations of young people's safety and unsafety, rather than surveying young people directly — consistent with WP16's role as the youth-worker counterpart to WP8.
- Open, thematic questioning: the first, largest activity (WP16.1) used four open guiding questions (what does safety mean to young people; what concerns exist; who worries about young people's safety; where does policy fail to connect with their lived experience), while WP16.2 and WP16.3 organized captured signals thematically per COSY life domain, in some cases explicitly merging overlapping themes into single, consolidated signals.
- A specific focus on girls' work: two of the four activities (WP16.2, WP16.3) were authored by a worker specialized in girls' work, surfacing a distinct and detailed set of gender-specific signals not captured in the same depth elsewhere in this report.
- A distinct organizational lens in the final activity: WP16.4 reflects a conversation with VIA support workers, whose individual, referral-based support model and closer proximity to policy consequences produced a noticeably different — and narrower, housing-dominated — set of signals compared with the broader thematic range captured in the other three activities.

As in other COSY ecosystems, this combination of formats made it possible to capture both a broad, group-generated overview of youth workers' concerns (WP16.1) and more granular, specialized professional observations (WP16.2, WP16.3, WP16.4) that a single uniform method might not have surfaced.

5. Activities organized for WP16 with youth workers connected to Amsterdam New-West

Four activities were organized with outreach youth workers and youth development workers connected to Amsterdam New-West to realize OO1.2. They are reported separately below, numbered WP16.1 through WP16.4. Consistent with how the underlying material was authored, WP16.1 is reported as a thematic narrative, WP16.2 and WP16.4 as discrete signal write-ups, and WP16.3 as a life-domain-structured account with a ranked summary table — each preserving the original structure of the source report rather than forcing a single uniform format.

Event	Date	Location	Format	Participants
WP16.1	28/05/2026	Amsterdam New-West	Facilitated group session with outreach youth workers, structured around four open guiding questions	11 (6 M, 5 F); 1 country
WP16.2	02/06/2026	Amsterdam New-West	Individually authored signal write-up by an outreach/girls' work youth worker, structured per signal with supporting indications	4 (2 M, 2 F); 1 country
WP16.3	09/07/2026	Amsterdam New-West	Individually authored signal write-up by a girls' work youth worker, structured per COSY life domain, with a ranked top-5 summary table	5 (5 F); 1 country
WP16.4	23/07/2026	Amsterdam New-West	Facilitated conversation with VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers	5 (3 F, 2 M); 1 country

WP16.1: Group signal-gathering session with outreach youth workers, Amsterdam New-West

Description

A group of 11 outreach youth workers active in Amsterdam New-West came together to share signals on the theme of safety. Four guiding questions structured the session: what does safety mean for young people; what concerns exist; who worries about young people's safety; and on which points do policy insufficiently connect with young people's lived experience.

Safety signals captured (thematic narrative, observation stage)

Psychological safety

The recurring theme is psychological safety. Youth workers describe that young people feel safe when they can be themselves, are accepted, and feel heard and respected. Trust, honesty, openness, reliability and keeping agreements are named as important conditions. According to youth workers, young people need an environment in which they can be vulnerable, set boundaries, and count on a listening ear. Social exclusion, stereotyping and the feeling of not being recognized have a directly negative effect on their sense of safety.

Physical safety and protection

Physical safety and protection also play an important role. Signals concerning weapon possession, self-defense, peer pressure and boundary-crossing behavior recur regularly. Youth workers observe that some young people carry weapons because they perceive others doing so as well. Public spaces are also not always seen as safe. This concerns not only concrete threats, but also feelings of unsafety arising from tensions between groups, conflicts, or negative experiences with others in the environment.

The influence of the social environment

A third notable theme concerns the influence of the social environment. The home situation is frequently named as a source of concern: several young people grow up in an unsafe home situation or face limited support from home. Parental supervision, social control, group formation and peer pressure also influence young people's behavior and sense of safety. Schools, too, are named as places where young people do not always feel safe. Polarization between groups — for example young people versus police, residents, teachers or other groups in society — further contributes to this.

Broader societal issues

On broader societal questions, youth workers name poverty, unequal opportunity, mental health problems, social media and discrimination, among others. Ethnic profiling and stereotyping are regularly named as experiences that can reduce trust in institutions. According to youth workers, social media sometimes amplifies polarization, peer pressure and negative imagery. Youth workers are additionally concerned about the appeal of making quick money, substance use, and the influence of online developments on young people's behavior.

Who worries about young people's safety, and how well institutions work together

The signals show that various parties worry about young people's safety. Alongside young people themselves, parents, schools, youth workers, police, enforcement and other professionals are named. At the same time, it is signaled that cooperation between these parties does not always run smoothly. Young people risk falling between different systems and support workers, creating unclarity about responsibilities and overall coordination.

Where policy does not sufficiently connect with practice

Finally, youth workers indicate that policy does not always connect with young people's practice. A need is expressed for more tailored approaches, more understanding of young people's lived experience, and a less punitive approach. Examples include giving a warning instead of immediately sanctioning, more attention to prevention, and strengthening trust between young people and institutions. Questions are also raised about existing regulations, protocols and the current integrated approach, which, according to some participants, do not sufficiently connect with young people's daily reality.

[Photo](#)



WP16.2: Individually authored signal write-up, Amsterdam New-West

Description

Signals were captured and written up individually by an outreach youth worker, drawing on recent direct observations and conversations with young people. Each signal below is presented with its associated COSY life-domain themes, the safety-signal type per the COSY framework, and the concrete indications from practice that support it.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety signal / observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Growing distrust between groups of young people	Justice / Police / Wellbeing (type: Psychological safety, Social exclusion)	Youth workers observe that conflicts between groups of young people increasingly lead to damaging reports to police or other authorities, with young people using such reports as part of mutual conflicts — producing escalation, distrust and feelings of unsafety. Example: young people deliberately set each other up ("lured into a trap"): a youth worker and a group of young people returning from an activity saw two boys walk home via the back of the community center, where they found eight police cars waiting; another group had called the police with a false report that these two boys were dangerous and armed.

Undocumented young people experience societal exclusion	Wellbeing / Education / Other: inclusion (type: Social exclusion, Societal barriers, Psychological safety)	Youth workers experience negative reactions from residents toward their work with undocumented young people, pointing to stigmatization and exclusion of a group already facing vulnerabilities such as trauma, uncertainty about residency status, limited language proficiency and limited access to services. Example: two youth workers who work extensively with undocumented young people report experiencing unsafety themselves — residents ask them why they do this work "with this scum". The youth workers note that if they, as adult professionals, are treated this way, it must be even harder for the young people themselves, who come from war zones, carry trauma, and do not speak the language.
Strong social control limits girls' freedom of movement	Gender / Public space / Wellbeing (type: Psychological safety, Social exclusion, Unsafe public spaces)	Youth workers signal that many girls experience continuous social control over their behavior, social contacts, appearance and presence in public space — not only in their own neighborhood, but beyond it. Girls report knowing they are unlikely to be physically harmed but do feel strong social control: they are "kept an eye on". This control is felt not only in their own neighborhood but also beyond it — even, as reported, at the level of the city. Supporting indication (from professionals, not the young people themselves): three female youth workers do not dare cycle through their own working neighborhood in the evening but do so anyway because it is their job. In conversations, boys offer to be called if help is needed; the workers themselves note it feels uncomfortable that adult women would need to call on young boys for their safety and explore with the young people how the neighborhoods could be made safer without the workers themselves acting as "bodyguards". Girls recognize this feeling but report not experiencing it in their own neighborhood.
Online freedom brings digital safety risks	Social media / Wellbeing (type: Digital side-effects,	For some young people, particularly girls, the online world forms an alternative to the social control they experience offline. This shift, however, brings new risks: the spread of photos, videos and other personal information. Online

	Psychological safety)	incidents do not simply disappear and can have long-lasting consequences for young people's social position, reputation and wellbeing. Youth workers note that more can happen "out of sight" online than offline, which they see as attractive to young people but also riskier: once images are posted, they remain.	
--	-----------------------	--	--

Overarching pattern and a methodological note

Signals 1, 2 and 3 show that different groups of young people — mutually conflicting groups, undocumented young people, and girls — each face distrust, stigmatization or control from their environment in their own way. This overarching pattern (unequal or distrustful treatment of specific groups of young people by their social environment) can be read as a common thread across the individual signals. Regarding signal 2, the authoring youth worker herself noted, "perhaps we should not compare" the severity of experiences between young people with and without Dutch nationality — a nuance preserved here, since the signal concerns the stigmatization and vulnerability of undocumented young people specifically, not a comparison between groups.

Photo



WP16.3: Individually authored girls' work signal write-up, Amsterdam New-West

Description

Signals were captured and written up individually by a girls' work youth worker, organized per COSY life domain rather than per conversation, drawing on recent practice with girls in Amsterdam New-West. Several overlapping raw observations were explicitly merged into single, consolidated signals by the authoring worker, as noted below; this structure and the accompanying merges are preserved from the source report.

Safety signals captured (thematic narrative, observation stage)

1. Health — Mental pressure and overload from a build-up of responsibilities

Girls experience pressure from multiple areas of life simultaneously (family, school, culture, social media, neighborhood, friend groups), including emotional strain from complex home situations: responsibilities for younger siblings and family from a young age; high expectations from family and society; role conflicts between home culture and societal expectations; and child maltreatment and problematic home situations recurring in casework.

3. Information — Insufficient resilience toward online information

Social media play a large role in identity formation and self-image; girls do not always have sufficient skills to critically assess online influences, including the influence of algorithms, comparison pressure, hypes and online trends.

6. Education / 7. Public space — Limited freedom of movement and unsafety in public space

Girls — and female students — experience social control and unsafety in public space more strongly than boys: "girls are allowed less"; unwritten rules about where girls may or may not go; male-dominated public spaces; control from family, culture and environment. Pedagogy students reported feeling unsafe and not daring to approach certain groups of boys during neighborhood assignments.

9. Social media (two signals, separated from overlap with "group dynamics", see below) — Growing influence of social media on identity and self-image

Striving for beauty ideals, FOMO, status and wanting to belong, aesthetic trends.

9. Social media — Online unsafety and digital boundary-crossing

"Exposing", sending images, and handling confidential online information.

11. Leisure — Limited room for leisure and independent relaxation

Care tasks for younger siblings, running errands for family members, and less room to be independently active outside the home.

12. Wellbeing — Loneliness and high emotional dependency

Loneliness as a recurring theme; social pressure complicates participation in groups/friendships. Some girls develop a strong dependency relationship with the girls' worker (emotional over-attachment, difficulty with healthy closeness/distance) — pointing to a lack of other supportive figures.

13. Gender / 7 (partially) — merged into one signal — Unequal treatment and role conflicts around being a girl/woman

Girls are structurally held to different norms and expectations than boys, and experience tension between different role expectations: stricter rules around freedom and relationships; more responsibilities within the family; responsibility for family honor/reputation; living between multiple cultures; neighborhood-bound behavioral norms.

9 + 14 — merged into one signal — Social exclusion via online and offline group dynamics

Conflicts between young people continue via social media; girl-on-girl spite (Queen Bee behavior, exclusion, loyalty conflicts, gossip) leads to psychological unsafety, reduced participation and social isolation.

13 + 14 — merged into one signal — Tension between cultural, societal and neighborhood identities

Girls navigate multiple, sometimes conflicting normative systems: dual cultural identity, neighborhood culture versus home culture, differing expectations from various communities.

Locally developed ranked summary (top 5 signals)

#	Signal	COSY safety-signal axis	Key indications
1	Girls experience limited freedom of movement and social control in public space	Unsafe public spaces	"Girls are allowed less"; unwritten rules; male-dominated spaces; sense of unsafety reported by pedagogy students
2	Girls navigate conflicting expectations from family, culture, neighborhood and society	Societal barriers	Dual cultural identity; neighborhood culture vs. home culture; early responsibilities at home
3	Social media reinforces pressure on self-image, status and social safety	Digital side-effects	Aesthetics/FOMO/algorithms; "exposing"; "stranglehold" (online pressure on private life)
4	Online and offline group dynamics drive social exclusion	Social exclusion	Girl-on-girl spite, Queen Bee behavior, fear of losing contact/a friend
5	Mental pressure and emotional strain are increasing due to a build-up of responsibilities	Psychological safety	Child maltreatment, loneliness, mental health, emotional dependency on the girls' worker

Physical safety does not appear as a stand-alone top-5 signal in this activity — it is currently visible mainly through the girls' worker's own experiential knowledge of violence, rather than directly through young people's own voice, and is recommended as a point of attention for follow-up input.

Separately flagged — not a youth safety signal, but a point of attention

Insufficient use of support networks (professionals): professionals report a strong personal sense of responsibility to solve problems themselves ("feeling the need to rescue young people"), alongside a need to escalate and collaborate earlier. This concerns the professional, not the safety/wellbeing/inclusion of young people themselves and therefore falls outside the definition of a local community safety signal — but is relevant to how girls' work is organized.

WP16.4: Conversation with VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers, Amsterdam New-West

Description

This activity brought together VIA (PerMens) support workers, whose individual, referral-based support model — receiving particularly challenging cases from street-corner-work colleagues — differs from the group-based approach of mainstream neighborhood youth work covered in the other three WP16 activities. Compared with youth workers spoken to earlier in the project, these colleagues were notably engaged with policy and politics and reported feeling the impact of flawed policy decisions more directly in their daily work.

Safety signals captured (thematic narrative, observation stage)

Housing as the dominant, shared theme

The theme affirmed by all workers present was housing. Many young people are being severely harmed by not being allocated housing, spending years on waiting lists, even though housing is their top priority for feeling safe. Many of these young people currently sleep on the street rather than in a shelter — most consider sleeping rough safer than staying in a shelter, despite shelter being available to them.

Workers feel a responsibility to offer these young people a safe place but feel powerless to act on this responsibility in practice, since no solution is simply available. Raising this with policymakers is a daily activity, but change comes about slowly, while in the meantime the situation of the young people they support does not improve.

Safety for themselves, as workers

Asked about the concept of safety for themselves personally, workers primarily raised themes of being able to be themselves and being able to stand up for themselves.

6. Consolidated overview of identified signals and context

Together, the four WP16 activities engaged 25 outreach youth workers and youth development workers (10 male, 15 female) connected to Amsterdam New-West, reached through a large mixed-gender group session (WP16.1), two individually authored signal write-ups by a worker specialized in girls' work (WP16.2, WP16.3), and a dedicated conversation with VIA individual-support workers (WP16.4). The table below consolidates the recurring themes across the four activities.

Recurring theme	Raised in	Cross-activity observation
Psychological safety: being heard, accepted and recognized	WP16.1, WP16.2, WP16.3	The most consistently raised theme across the three group/individual youth-work activities: WP16.1 frames it broadly (trust, honesty, acceptance), while WP16.2 and WP16.3 document specific mechanisms undermining it — distrustful reporting between peer groups, stigmatization of undocumented young people, and girl-on-girl social exclusion.

Gendered social control and restricted freedom of movement for girls	WP16.1 (briefly), WP16.2, WP16.3	A strongly corroborated signal: WP16.2 and WP16.3, both authored by workers specialized in girls' work, independently describe girls (and even female professionals and students) limiting their own movement due to social control rather than concrete physical threat — consistent with the equivalent signal raised directly by girls themselves in WP8.
Distrust and instrumentalized reporting to authorities between peer groups	WP16.1, WP16.2	WP16.1's broad observation about "polarization" and strained trust in institutions is given a very concrete, documented example in WP16.2 (a false armed-and-dangerous report used as a tool in a peer conflict, resulting in eight-car police response).
Social media as an amplifier of pressure, exclusion and risk	WP16.1, WP16.2, WP16.3	Raised in all three youth-work-facing activities, with escalating specificity: general concern about polarization and negative imagery (WP16.1), the risk of online content becoming a stand-alone digital safety concern (WP16.2), and, in WP16.3, a detailed breakdown into identity/self-image pressure, online boundary-crossing ("exposing"), and its fusion with offline girl-on-girl exclusion dynamics.
Stigmatization and exclusion of undocumented young people	WP16.2	A signal raised only once but with striking specificity and self-reflective nuance: the authoring youth worker explicitly cautioned against comparing the severity of experiences between young people with and without Dutch nationality, a methodological caveat preserved verbatim in this report.
Housing insecurity and homelessness among young people	WP16.4	The dominant, unanimous theme of the VIA conversation, and structurally distinct from the other three activities: rather than a diffuse public-space or relational safety concern, this is a concrete, acute material insecurity

		(years-long waiting lists; young people choosing the street over a shelter) directly tied to feeling unsafe, echoing the same dynamic documented directly from young people in WP8.4 and WP7.	
Youth workers' own sense of powerlessness in the face of structural/policy problems	WP16.1, WP16.4	WP16.1's broader observation that "policy does not always connect with practice" is sharpened considerably in WP16.4, where VIA workers describe daily advocacy toward policymakers producing only slow change, alongside a personal sense of responsibility and powerlessness — a theme also echoed in the professional-level "insufficient use of support networks" observation flagged separately in WP16.3.	
Cultural and identity tension between home, neighborhood and wider society	WP16.1, WP16.3	WP16.1 raises this at a general level (polarization, discrimination, unequal opportunity); WP16.3 documents it in much greater depth specifically for girls, describing a dual cultural identity and conflicting normative systems across home, neighborhood and broader society.	

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

The four WP16 activities intentionally combined different professional vantage points on the same ecosystem: a broad, group-generated overview of concerns from generalist neighborhood youth workers (WP16.1); two rounds of specialized, individually authored girls' work signals from the same worker, allowing observations from 2 June to be revisited and deepened by 9 July (WP16.2, WP16.3); and a conversation with VIA's individual, referral-based support model (WP16.4), reflecting the outreach youth work landscape described in Section 3.3 — delivered through ONE jongerenwerk (Be OK, Combiwel, IMD) and VIA/PerMens's outreach approach.

The distinctiveness of the VIA conversation (WP16.4) is itself a notable finding: where the other three activities surfaced a broad, multi-domain range of psychological, social and digital safety signals, VIA's individual-support, referral-based model — working with young people already flagged as facing particularly challenging circumstances — produced a narrower but more acute set of concerns, dominated overwhelmingly by housing insecurity. This is consistent with VIA's profile as described in Section 3.3: support workers who take on the most difficult cases referred to from street-corner work colleagues, and who, per their own account, feel the practical consequences of policy shortcomings more directly than generalist youth workers.

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.