

**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:	WP15
Event name:	Local community safety signals of professionals working with young people in the capital Amsterdam North
Type:	Training
In situ/online:	In situ
Location:	The Netherlands 1. Huize Molenaar, Korte Nieuwstraat 6, 3512 NM Utrecht 2. PerMens, Pinksterbloemstraat 1, 1032 GH Amsterdam 3. Klusfabriek, Mosplein, Amsterdam Noord 4. PerMens, Pinksterbloemstraat 1, 1032 GH Amsterdam 5. PerMens, Eerste Ringdijkstraat 5B, 1097 BC Amsterdam
Date(s):	1. 02/06/2026 2. 09/07/2026 (13h-15h) 3. 09/07/2026 (16h-18h) 4. 22/07/2026 5. 23/07/2026
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.uitdemarge.be/cosy/
Participants	
Female:	1. 2 2. 1 3. 0 4. 2 5. 1
Male:	1. 5 2. 3 3. 5 4. 5 5. 1
Non-binary:	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 4. 0 5. 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 15 (WP15) of the COSY project — "Local community safety signals of outreach youth workers and other professionals connected to the capital Amsterdam North" — 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 WP7 gathered signals directly from young people in Amsterdam North, WP15 turns to the professionals who work with them daily. In addition to outreach youth workers, WP15 deliberately widened its scope to include street coaches, ambulant supervisors, a municipal youth and safety officer, and VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers — professionals who, while not all formally "youth workers", are structurally present in young people's daily lives and therefore well placed to observe recurring safety signals. Five activities were organized on this basis. 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 North;
- describes the approach used to capture signals from professionals working with young people;
- documents the five activities organized for WP15;
- presents the signals identified, organized thematically distinguishing what professionals observe about young people's safety from what professionals themselves encounter in their own work;
- closes with a consolidated overview, the notable insights identified.

This report constitutes the underlying material for WP15 deliverable D9-16.2 ("Method(s) to determine what a local community signal is", shared with WP9-16) and for the WP15 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 WP15 conversations with professionals connected to Amsterdam North. 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. In WP15, this same lens was applied to professionals' collective observations of young people, while a smaller number of observations concerning professionals' own working conditions (e.g. GDPR/AVG constraints, caseload pressure, the emotional toll of policy powerlessness) are reported separately, since they describe the professional's own position rather than a signal about young people directly.

Four working principles apply throughout: voluntary participation, a safe conversational environment, confidentiality, and the leadership of youth voice — in WP15, extended to include the professional voice and frontline expertise of those who work with young people daily.

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

Every observation raised by professionals 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 WP15 signals presented below already reflect an initial level of this filtering: the source material explicitly separates signals about young people's safety from observations about professionals' own working conditions, since only the former meet the decision tree's definition of a local community safety signal.

WP15.2–WP15.4 additionally show a distinct pattern: because the same signals recurred independently across three separate professional sessions without being individually attributed to one session, this itself supports criterion 4 (pattern/repeated experience) at a stronger level than a single session could.

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 WP15 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 North

Amsterdam North (Amsterdam-Noord) forms a distinctive context for research into safety and connectedness among young people. The borough has a strong history as a working-class area and has undergone major spatial and social change in recent years. New residential neighborhoods, amenities and population groups have contributed to a shifting social dynamic, while existing questions around equal opportunity, education, social mobility and the accessibility of public space for young people remain present.

These developments make Amsterdam North an interesting context for studying how young people experience their position in the neighborhood. Questions about safety, encounter, recognition and the feeling of belonging take on particular significance in an environment where different lived realities, interests and expectations come together.

In recent years there has also been growing attention to young people's involvement in local decision-making and in shaping their living environment. Initiatives such as the Youth Ambassadors of Amsterdam North show that young people are increasingly seen as conversation partners for administrators and societal organizations. Within the borough, there is an explicit search for ways to involve young people more structurally in policy development and societal issues — pointing to a growing recognition of young people as active participants in public debate and in the development of their neighborhood.

At the same time, Amsterdam North faces challenges linked to rapid area development and the changing design of public space. Urban debates increasingly address the extent to which children and young people experience sufficient room to meet one another, move around freely, and feel at home in their own neighborhood. The safety debate is thereby also connected to questions of ownership, visibility and young people's place in public space.

During the course of the COSY project, an administrative development is additionally taking place within Amsterdam's youth policy: youth work is shifting from a portfolio centered on participation, sport and education-to-labor-market transitions, toward a broader portfolio in which education, youth care and youth work are more strongly connected. This gives rise to a more integrated approach to growing up, wellbeing, equal opportunity and participation.

For the COSY project, Amsterdam North therefore offers a context in which questions of safety, connectedness and participation are closely tied to urban change, public space, and young people's position as co-shapers of their living environment. For WP15, this context is directly relevant to the professional roles consulted: street coaches and ambulant supervisors work at the interface of public space and enforcement, the youth and safety officer works within the borough's evolving integrated youth policy, and school-based signals connect directly to the borough's education and equal-opportunity challenges. VIA (PerMens) support workers, consulted for WP15.5, take a more individual, city-wide referral-based approach — a profile also documented in the WP Amsterdam New-West — meaning their signals reflect young people's most acute, individually escalated needs rather than the broader neighborhood-level patterns captured elsewhere in this report.

4. Approach: capturing signals from professionals working with young people

To complement the signals gathered directly from young people in WP7, WP15 sought the perspective of professionals who are structurally present in young people's daily lives connected to Amsterdam North. Five activities were organized between 2 June and 23 July 2026: an individually authored signal write-up session in Utrecht (WP15.1); three sessions with outreach and ambulant professionals in Amsterdam North, consolidated into a single signals report (WP15.2–WP15.4); and a dedicated conversation with VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers (WP15.5).

The explicit aim across all five activities was to gain insight into which safety signals professionals observe, what they consider the underlying causes to be, and what obstacles they encounter in their own work when trying to respond to these signals.

5. Activities organized for WP15 with professionals connected to Amsterdam North

Five activities were organized with professionals connected to Amsterdam North to realize OO1.2. They are reported separately below, numbered WP15.1 through WP15.5. As WP15.2, WP15.3 and WP15.4 are documented in the source material as a single consolidated signals report rather than three separately attributed sets of signals, the full signal list is presented once, under WP15.2, with WP15.3 and WP15.4 cross-referencing it explicitly.

Event	Date	Location	Format	Participants
WP15.1	02/06/2026	Huize Molenaar, Korte Nieuwstraat 6, 3512 NM Utrecht	Individually authored signal write-up	7 (2 F, 5 M)
WP15.2	09/07/2026, 13:00–15:00	PerMens, Pinksterbloemstraat 1, 1032 GH Amsterdam	Professional signal-gathering conversation (consolidated report)	4 (1 F, 3 M)
WP15.3	09/07/2026, 16:00–18:00	Klusfabriek, Mosplein, Amsterdam Noord	Professional signal-gathering conversation (consolidated report)	5 (0 F, 5 M)
WP15.4	22/07/2026	PerMens, Pinksterbloemstraat 1, 1032 GH Amsterdam	Professional signal-gathering conversation (consolidated report)	7 (2 F, 5 M)

WP15.5	23/07/2026	PerMens, Eerste Ringdijkstraat 5B, 1097 BC Amsterdam	Conversation with VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers	2 (1 F, 1 M)
--------	------------	--	--	--------------

WP15.1: Individually authored signal write-up, Utrecht

Description

Signals were captured and written up individually by an outreach youth worker, drawing on recent direct observations and conversations with young people connected to Amsterdam North. The session itself took place in Utrecht as a shared regional training/network moment, but the signals concern young people and professional practice connected to Amsterdam North. 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.
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". 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 neighborhood 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, Psychological safety)	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 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.

WP15.2: Professional signal-gathering conversation, PerMens Pinksterbloemstraat

Description

In addition to the conversations with young people documented in WP7, signals were gathered from professionals who work with young people connected to Amsterdam North daily. Conversations were held with street coaches, ambulant supervisors, a youth and safety officer, and youth workers.

The aim was to gain insight into which safety signals professionals observe, what they consider the underlying causes, and what obstacles they encounter in their own work. As explained in Section 5, this activity, together with WP15.3 and WP15.4, is documented as a single consolidated signals does not attribute individual signals

to one specific one of the three sessions. The full signal list gathered across these three sessions is presented below.

Safety signals captured (observation stage)

Safety signal/ observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Young people go through a great deal but do not always know where to turn	Information / Wellbeing / Police	Much is regarded as "snitching" — sharing information is often avoided not out of shame, but because if the person responsible finds out who reported them, the young person who spoke up can end up in trouble themselves. As a result, signals remain internalized and help arrives too late.
Emotional unsafety: young people hide behind a persona	Wellbeing	Young people hide behind a persona and do not share who they really are; this is not talked about.
Physical unsafety occurs more often between young people themselves than between young people and outsiders	Public space / Other: social dynamics	—
Gendered pattern in unsafety: images/gossip for girls, recruitment/crime for boys	Social media / Gender / Public space	For girls, this often concerns images and gossip circulating via social media; for boys, it more often concerns recruitment, criminal involvement and the temptation of making quick money.
Too-young involvement in addiction; nude photos of very young girls	Health / Wellbeing / Gender	One youth worker signals concern about too-young involvement in addiction. Nude photos of girls as young as 10 were also named as a worrying signal.
The online world as the greatest concern, particularly for girls	Social media / Gender / Wellbeing	Photos circulate; girls are bullied, blackmailed and recruited online. Online is their lived world.
Young people share locations via social media without awareness of the risks	Social media / Public space	They are not aware of the risks and handle this carelessly.

Many parents are digitally illiterate	Social media / Other: social dynamics	They get little insight into what happens online in their children's lives.
Young people underestimate online dangers	Social media / Wellbeing	They know that all kinds of things happen online but treat this lightly.
Home situation receives too little attention in policy and approach	Housing / Wellbeing / Other: socio-economic	Specific neighborhoods see significant poverty and domestic violence; according to some professionals, most unsafety originates there.
Many families live below the poverty line in certain parts of Amsterdam North	Other: socio-economic	—
External temptations (quick money) play a major role	Housing / Other: socio-economic / Work	Young people lack the patience to wait. Housing and financial stability are described by some professionals as the basis that must be in place before other forms of help can take hold.
Things more often go wrong at larger schools	Education	Anonymity makes it harder to pick up on signals.
Changing school leadership and teaching staff creates a lack of continuity	Education	Trust must be rebuilt repeatedly, which does not help safety, particularly at larger schools.
Threshold to share things at school is often too high	Education / Information / Wellbeing	Young people who share something risk getting themselves or their parents into trouble (personal problems/vulnerabilities, not "snitching"). Boundaries and expectations are not clearly outlined. Trust and relationship are key here.
The system moves too slowly	Police / Other: institutional	Practically speaking — and sometimes literally — a young person must first be picked up by police before help follows. Professionals are sent from pillar to post.
Professionals see signals but cannot act on them	Other: institutional	Too much evidence is required before steps can be taken, leading to a sense of powerlessness.

GDPR (AVG) constraints hinder professionals' work	Information / Other: institutional	All partners are limited in what they are allowed to do to intervene.
Policy does not focus on children under 12	Other: institutional / Policy	Professionals specifically want to act preventively with younger children, but this is currently not possible.
Too much focus on the tip of the iceberg	Other: institutional / Wellbeing	The young people with the largest problems get attention; finances receive attention, but underlying causes do not. Prevention receives not enough funding and room.
Young people are treated as numbers	Other: social dynamics	Decisions are made for them rather than alongside them, with too little effort to understand their lived experience.
Long waiting lists; frequently changing support workers	Wellbeing / Other: institutional	When help is needed, it takes too long to arrive. There is no relationship of trust, and none can form when a young person keeps having to start over with someone new.

WP15.3: Professional signal-gathering conversation, Klusfabriek Mosplein

Description

This second of three sessions with professionals working with young people connected to Amsterdam North took place at Klusfabriek, Mosplein, directly following WP15.2 on the same day.

As explained in Section 5 and in WP15.2's Event Description Sheet, the signals gathered across WP15.2, WP15.3 and WP15.4 are documented in the source material as a single consolidated report, without attribution of individual signals to one specific session.

WP15.4: Professional signal-gathering conversation, PerMens Pinksterbloemstraat

Description

These third of three sessions with professionals working with young people connected to Amsterdam North took place at PerMens, Pinksterbloemstraat, on 22 July 2026, following WP15.2 and WP15.3.

As explained in Section 5 and in WP15.2's, the signals gathered across WP15.2, WP15.3 and WP15.4 are documented as a single consolidated report, without attribution of individual signals to one specific session.

WP15.5: Conversation with VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers

Description

This activity brought together VIA (PerMens) individual-support workers, whose individual, referral-based support model — receiving particularly challenging cases from street-corner-work colleagues — differs from the group- and neighborhood-based approach of the other WP15 activities. Compared with professionals spoken to earlier, 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 (observation stage)

Safety signal/ observation	Life domain(s)	Context/ illustrative content
Housing as the dominant, shared theme	Housing / Wellbeing	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' sense of responsibility and powerlessness regarding housing	Housing / Wellbeing / Other: institutional	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 the workers themselves

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 five WP15 activities engaged 25 professionals working with young people connected to Amsterdam North (6 female, 19 male), all recorded on signed participant lists: 7 in WP15.1 (2 F, 5 M), 4 in WP15.2 (1 F, 3 M), 5 in WP15.3 (0 F, 5 M), 7 in WP15.4 (2 F, 5 M), and 2 in WP15.5 (1 F, 1 M). The table below consolidates the recurring themes across all five activities.

Recurring theme	Raised in	Cross-activity observation
Gendered social control and restricted freedom of movement for girls	WP15.1, WP15.2–WP15.4 (online world section)	Both sources independently describe girls limiting their own behavior and movement due to

		social control rather than concrete physical threat; WP15.1 adds the striking detail that even female professionals avoid cycling through their own working neighborhood at night.	
The online world as a growing, gendered risk	WP15.1, WP15.2–WP15.4	Both sources name the online world as a distinct and serious risk, particularly for girls, and both note that once images or information are shared online, they cannot be retracted and their consequences persist. WP15.2–WP15.4 add that parents' limited digital literacy compounds this risk.	
Distrust and instrumentalized reporting to authorities	WP15.1, WP15.2–WP15.4 ("snitching"/system slowness)	WP15.2–WP15.4's broad observation about system slowness, evidentiary thresholds and reluctance to "snitch" is given a very concrete, documented example in WP15.1.	
Stigmatization and exclusion of vulnerable/undocumented young people	WP15.1	Raised in WP15.1, with a self-reflective methodological nuance preserved from the source: the authoring youth worker explicitly cautioned against comparing the severity of experiences between young people with and without Dutch nationality.	
System slowness, evidentiary thresholds and GDPR/AVG constraints	WP15.2–WP15.4	A theme specific to the broader professional sample consulted across WP15.2–WP15.4 (including the youth and safety officer), not directly echoed in WP15.1's more narrowly youth-work-focused observations.	
Home situation, poverty and material insecurity as a root cause	WP15.2–WP15.4	Professionals across WP15.2–WP15.4 describe the home situation and poverty as receiving too little policy attention despite being, in their view, the origin of	

		most unsafety; housing and financial stability are named as the necessary basis before other support can take hold.
Housing insecurity and homelessness among young people	WP15.5	The dominant, unanimous theme of the VIA conversation, and structurally distinct from the other WP15 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 housing/poverty theme raised more generally in WP15.2–WP15.4, but at a more acute, individually escalated level consistent with VIA's referral-based caseload.
Professionals' own sense of powerlessness in the face of structural/policy problems	WP15.2–WP15.4, WP15.5	WP15.2–WP15.4's observation that professionals "see signals but cannot act on them" is echoed directly in WP15.5, where VIA workers describe daily advocacy toward policymakers producing only slow change, alongside a personal sense of responsibility and powerlessness regarding housing specifically.
Trust, continuity and relationship as the key protective/success factor	WP15.1, WP15.2–WP15.4	A cross-cutting theme: WP15.2–WP15.4 identify long waiting lists and frequently changing support workers as directly undermining the trust relationships that make support effective, while WP15.1 documents professionals' own efforts to build exactly this kind of trust with girls specifically around safety in public space.

Photos





7. Notable insights

1. Too late, too slow, too bureaucratic. Almost all professionals note that the system only starts moving once a situation has already escalated. This frustration is widely shared.
2. Online is the blind spot of policy. Professionals see the online world as one of the biggest risk factors. Policy and parents have little grip on this. This is a particularly urgent and underestimated theme for girls specifically.

What also stands out is that young people themselves do not name the online world as one of their biggest challenges — this framing comes mainly from professionals. This divergence between the professional and the youngster perspective (see WP7) is itself worth flagging for further exploration.

3. Trust is the core of effective work. Professionals who achieve results do so through relationships, time and continuity. Frequently changing faces and long waiting lists undermine precisely what works.
4. Housing is the single most acute, unanimous concern among individual-support workers. Where WP15.2–WP15.4's broader professional sample names housing and poverty as one root cause among several, WP15.5's VIA workers — who receive the most challenging individual cases — name it as the dominant, near-universal concern, to the point that young people are choosing street homelessness over available shelter provision.

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.