CO-SECUR
Co-creating urban security solutions

Community Security Lens Worksheets

Five ready-to-use canvases for civil society organisations





Document details

Deliverable D.3.2
"CO-SECUR learnings to foster security and security perception"

Legal disclaimer
- Call: HORIZON-CL3-2022-SSRI-01 (Strengthened Security Research and Innovation 2022)
- Topic: HORIZON-CL3-2022-SSRI-01-04
- Type of Action: HORIZON-RIA

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Authors
CO-SECUR consortium

How to cite this deliverable
Community Security Lens Worksheets for Civil Society Organisations (2026). CO-SECUR learnings to foster security and security perception. Available in Co-SECUR website at: Resources - cosecur

Project consortium
The CO-SECUR consortium, led by Kveloce, brings together 10 multidisciplinary partners with expertise in participatory research, public engagement, and mixed methods. The selection of partners from 9 European countries - Spain, BelgiRum, Finland, Germany, Portugal, Romania, Poland, Greece, and Lithuania reflects the project's goal to address the complex diversity of laws, security measures, politics, and social realities of different European regions.

Kveloce - SENIOR EUROPA SOCIEDAD LIMITADA | UVEG - UNIVERSITAT DE VALENCIA | SG SAFERGLOBE RY | DEFUS: DEUTSCH-EUROPAISCHES FORUM FUR URBANE SICHERHEIT e.V | SHINE 2EUROPE LDA | EIP - EUROPEAN INTEGRATED PROJECT | EVALU sp. Zo.o. | TERO MONOPROSOPI IKE | SMART CONTINENT LT UAB | DIGITALEUROPE AISBL

Table Of Contents

Community Security Lens Worksheets introduction 04

Before you start: safeguarding 05

Before you start: facilitation 06

Canvas 1: Evidence + Challenge 07

Canvas 2: Five-Lens Gap Scan 08

Canvas 3: Partnership + Response Pathway 10

Canvas 4: Joint Action + Reality Check 11

Monitoring Plan (part of Canvas 4) 12

Canvas 5: Results + Learning 13

Community Security Lens

Five ready-to-use canvases for civil society organisations

1 Evidence + challenge	2 Five-lens gap scan	3 Partnership + pathway	4 Joint action + reality check	5 Results + learning

How to use

Work through Canvases 1-5 in order. During Canvas 4, complete the supporting Monitoring Plan before starting the action. Return to the plan when reviewing evidence in Canvas 5. Use brief evidence-based notes. Mark unknowns instead of guessing. Involve affected communities and relevant public, private, research and civil society partners.

What you will produce

A concise Community Security Action File: a shared challenge, priority gaps, a workable partnership, evidence-linked actions, a user reality check, and a learning decision.

Each Canva displays a suggested time allocation to be completed. In total, the suggested 4 hours 30 minutes to 5 hours 45 minutes covers the five canvas sessions, but additional time is needed for preparation, partner agreement, implementation and follow-up.

Use for neighbourhood safety, public transport, nightlife, gender-based violence prevention, polarisation and disinformation, public spaces, and mass events or large gatherings.

CO-SECUR

Funded by the European Union

Before you Start

Handling Community information safely

The Community Security Lens is designed to capture community experiences, perceptions and ideas. When using the canvases, organisations should take simple steps to protect participants' privacy and wellbeing.

Recording community input

When documenting discussions, focus on themes, concerns and experiences rather than identifying individuals. **Avoid recording names, contact details or information that could reveal a person's identity** unless there is a clear reason to do so and appropriate consent has been obtained. Where examples or incidents are discussed, summarise them in a way that protects confidentiality and prevents individuals from being recognised.

Storing and sharing completed canvases

Completed canvases may contain sensitive information about communities, local concerns or specific incidents. **Store completed documents securely and share them only with people who need access for the purposes of the activity**. If results are shared more widely, remove any personal or identifying information and present findings in an aggregated or anonymous form wherever possible.

Responding to safeguarding concerns or disclosures

The toolkit is not intended to provide specialist safeguarding, legal or support services. However, participants may disclose experiences of harm, abuse, violence or situations that place themselves or others at risk.

Before running a session, **identify the appropriate local safeguarding, victim-support, social-service or emergency referral routes that may be needed**. If a disclosure arises:

- Listen respectfully and avoid pressuring the person to provide additional details.
- Do not promise complete confidentiality if there is a risk of harm that may require referral.
- Follow your organisation's safeguarding procedures, where available.

The purpose of the canvases is to understand community challenges and inform action, not to investigate individual cases.

Funded by
the European Union

Before you Start

Facilitating a Community Security Lens session

The Community Security Lens works best when completed through a structured discussion involving community members, stakeholders and practitioners with relevant knowledge of the local context. The role of the facilitator is not to provide answers, but to guide discussion, ensure different perspectives are heard.

Who should facilitate?

The facilitator should be someone who is **trusted by participants, able to remain neutral, and familiar with the purpose of the exercise**. They do not need specialist security expertise, but they should be comfortable managing group discussion and ensuring that all participants have the opportunity to contribute. Where possible, consider involving a note-taker so that the facilitator can focus on guiding the discussion rather than recording information.

Recording the discussion

The canvases are intended to capture key points, themes and areas of agreement or concern rather than a verbatim record of the conversation. Notes should focus on issues, experiences and recommendations raised during the discussion. **Where participants express different views, these should be recorded rather than merged into a single position**. If using additional methods of recording, such as detailed notes or audio recordings, ensure participants are informed in advance and that any organisational policies on data protection and confidentiality are followed.

Managing disagreement

Different participants may have different experiences, priorities and perspectives. Disagreement can be valuable because it helps reveal diverse perceptions of security challenges. **Facilitators should encourage respectful discussion, allow participants to explain their views**, and avoid pushing the group towards artificial consensus. Where significant differences of opinion remain, these can be recorded directly on the canvas as different perspectives rather than treated as a problem to be resolved.

Ensuring inclusive participation

Some participants may be more comfortable speaking than others. **Facilitators should actively create opportunities for all participants to contribute, particularly those whose perspectives may be less represented in local decision-making processes**. When completing sections relating to stakeholders, affected groups or "missing voices", participants should be encouraged to reflect on whose perspectives may not be represented in the discussion and what barriers might prevent their participation. Identifying missing voices is an important part of understanding community security needs and strengthening the inclusiveness of future engagement activities.

Funded by
the European Union

Canvas 1 - Evidence + Challenge Canvas

Combine available evidence and community experience, then frame the challenge before discussing solutions.

Suggested time: 45–60 minutes. Complete with community members and relevant partners where possible. Mark unknowns rather than guessing

Issue / initiative	Location / setting	Date	Completed with

A. What is happening?
Describe the concern, where/when it happens, who raised it, and why it matters now.

B. What important information is missing, who could help obtain it, and what can safely be decided with the information currently available?
List recorded incidents, complaints, service data, studies or observations. Note the source, period and limitations.

C. What does community experience add?
Capture perceptions, lived experiences, barriers, trust, avoidance, and differences between groups. Identify missing voices.

D. Assets already available
List trusted people and organisations, services, spaces, networks, communication channels and skills. Include any existing initiatives or actions that already address the issue.

E. What may sit behind the visible problem?
Possible access, coordination, trust, service, spatial, narrative, inclusion or technology factors. Separate evidence from assumptions.

F. Shared challenge statement
[Group/community] experiences [specific challenge] in [setting], especially when [conditions]. Evidence suggests [factors]. We want [change] without [unintended harm].

CO-SECUR

Funded by the European Union

Canvas 2 - Five-Lens Gap Scan Canvas

Review what is already being done and use the five CO-SECUR lenses to identify what is working, what is missing and what may need to change.

Suggested time: 60–75 minutes. Complete with community members and relevant partners where possible. Mark unknowns rather than guessing.

Issue / initiative	Location / setting	Date	Completed with

What is being done	1. Voice + influence	2. Partnerships + trust	3. Information + narratives	4. Place + Access	5. Technology + ethics
List the main actions, services or interventions already addressing the issue. Who leads each one, who is involved, and what is known about how well it works? Current action or intervention: Responsible organisation and other actors involved: What appears to be working: Known limitation or unanswered question:	Who defined the problem and the current response? Who can shape decisions? Who is affected but missing? Can people see how their input was used?	Who currently leads or supports the response? Who is trusted? Are the relevant actors connected? Are responsibilities, resources and referral routes clear?	Does information about the issue and the current response reach people, make sense, feel credible and enable action? Are rumours or stigma shaping the situation?	Where and when do barriers arise? Does the current response work equally well in different places and for different groups? What community assets could be used more effectively?	Is technology already part of the response? What need does it address? Who may be excluded? Is data use clear? Is human or non-digital support available?
	Main gap + evidence What is already in place? What is missing? Evidence/source: Status: □ sufficiently addressed □ partly addressed □ major gap □ unknown	**Main gap + evidence** What is already in place? What is missing? Evidence/source: Status: □ sufficiently addressed □ partly addressed □ major gap □ unknown	**Main gap + evidence** What is already in place? What is missing? Evidence/source: Status: □ sufficiently addressed □ partly addressed □ major gap □ unknown	**Main gap + evidence** What is already in place? What is missing? Evidence/source: Status: □ sufficiently addressed □ partly addressed □ major gap □ unknown	**Main gap + evidence** What is already in place? What is missing? Evidence/source: Status: □ sufficiently addressed □ partly addressed □ major gap □ unknown

Funded by the European Union

Canvas 2 -Five-Lens Gap Scan Canvas (continuation...)

PRIORITY GAPS (Consider the seriousness and urgency of the problem, unequal effects on groups, available resources and the realistic opportunity to improve the response. Agree the priorities with affected people; record significant disagreement)

1)

2)

3)

Why these first?

Funded by
the European Union

Canvas 3 -Partnership + Response Pathway Canvas

Build the combination of community trust, public responsibility, private capacity, civil society knowledge and specialist expertise needed to act. Use the priority gaps identified in Canvas 2 to decide which partners, capacities and connections are needed.

Suggested time: 60–75 minutes. Complete with community members and relevant partners where possible. Mark unknowns rather than guessing.

Issue / initiative	Location / setting	Date	Completed with

A. Partners needed

List affected communities, CSOs, public actors, private/operational actors, researchers and specialist services needed. Identify actors who are currently involved and those still missing.

B. What each partner brings

For each priority partner: knowledge, trust, reach, authority, infrastructure, expertise, resources and limitations.

C. Power + fair participation

Who decides? Who controls resources? Who carries delivery or risk? Are CSOs and affected groups shaping decisions, not only providing outreach? What shared outcome have the essential partners agreed? Which roles and resources are confirmed, which are only proposed, and what remains unresolved?

D. TEST THE RESPONSE PATHWAY

1. Community entry point	2. Trusted intermediary	3. Responsible actor	4. Specialist support	5. Feedback + escalation
Where would someone first raise a concern?	Who listens, explains limits and supports referral?	Who has formal authority to respond?	What qualified service may be needed?	Who follows up, by when, and how? If an essential response is unavailable, which activities can proceed within the group's role, and which need to be postponed or referred for specialist advice?

Funded by the European Union

Canvas 4 - Joint Action + Reality Check Canvas

Design a small, evidence-linked action and test whether it works for the people expected to use or experience it.

Suggested time: 60–75 minutes. Complete with community members and relevant partners where possible. Mark unknowns rather than guessing. Use the priority gaps and lessons identified in Canvas 2 to design a small, evidence-linked action and test whether it works for the people expected to use or experience it.

Issue / initiative	Location / setting	Date	Completed with

A. Evidence link + previous action

Which priority gap from Canvas 2 does this action address? What evidence and lessons support the proposed action? What assumptions still need to be tested?

B. Intended change

If we [action], then [change] for [group/setting], because [reason]. Progress will be visible when...

C. Action + scope

What exactly will happen, where, for whom and by when? Is it a pilot? How does it improve the current response? What is outside its scope?

D. Roles + resources

Accountable lead; CSO, public, private, community and specialist contributions; staff, budget, access, training and authorisations. Have the accountable lead and essential partners confirmed their roles, resources and any required authorisations?
Decision: □ proceed □ adjust □ postpone and return to Canvas 3 □ seek specialist advice.
Record unresolved conditions and who will resolve them.

E. Inclusion + do-no-harm check

Who may be excluded? Could the action stigmatise, displace harm, increase fear or misuse data? What professional input is needed?

F. Community reality check

Who will test the action? What concrete task or situation will they test? Does the action address the priority gap identified in Canvas 2? What worked, what caused confusion and what created barriers?
Decision: □ keep as designed □ adjust □ redesign □ seek specialist advice

Before implementation, complete the supporting Monitoring Plan: choose 2-4 manageable indicators, record the starting point, and agree methods, review dates and responsibilities.

CO-SECUR

Funded by the European Union

Supporting sheet - Monitoring Plan – prepare during Canvas 4 and use in Canvas 5

Use this sheet before implementation (prepare during Canvas 4) to decide what change you will track, how you will collect information, when you will review it and who will be responsible. Keep the plan realistic: choose 2–4 indicators that are useful and manageable.

Issue / initiative	Location / setting	Date	Completed with

1. **WHAT WILL YOU TRACK?**

Expected change	Indicator / sign of progress	Starting point	Method / source	When to check	Who collects / reviews it?
What should improve for the community, response or partnership?	What small, observable change would show progress?	What is known before the action starts?	How will you find out?	Select a review point or add a date.	Name the responsible person or partner.

2. **CHOOSE SIMPLE METHODS**

Ask people	Observe	Use existing records	Reflect together
□ Short questionnaire □ Feedback card □ Informal interview	□ Direct observation □ Community diary □ Safety walk	□ Participation data □ Complaints/incidents □ Referral or service records	□ Partner debrief □ Focus group □ Community discussion

3. **SET THE REVIEW POINTS**

When will you check?	What will trigger an earlier review?
□ Before the action □ During implementation □ Immediately afterwards □ 1–3 months later □ Other:	Examples: a new concern, low participation, an unintended effect, a safeguarding issue, or evidence that the action is not reaching the intended group.

Use in Canvas 5: Bring the collected information to the Results + Learning Canvas. Compare it with the starting point, note differences between groups and record unintended effects. If information is limited, mark the finding as an early indication rather than a confirmed result

CO-SECUR

Funded by the European Union

Canvas 5 - Result + Learning Canvas

Review community outcomes, the response system and the partnership, then decide what should continue or change.

Suggested time: 45–60 minutes. Complete with community members and relevant partners where possible. Mark unknowns rather than guessing.

Issue / initiative	Location / setting	Date	Completed with

A. What changed for the community?

Using the indicators and feedback collected, what changed in access, understanding, participation, awareness of support, trust, perceived safety or barriers? Did different groups experience different results? Were there unintended effects?

Compare the information with the starting point and consider differences in groups. Remember that improved use or satisfaction alone do not necessarily mean improved community safety.

How confident are we in these findings?

Consider the relevance and consistency of the sources, coverage of affected groups and remaining limitations. More reports may indicate easier reporting rather than greater harm, and a before/after difference alone does not establish that the action caused it.

□ Strong evidence
□ Some evidence
□ Early indication only
□ Not enough information yet

B. What changed in the response?

What evidence shows that communication, access, referral pathways, service delivery, design or technology improved? Did community evidence influence practice or decisions?

How confident are we in these findings?

Consider the relevance and consistency of the sources, coverage of affected groups and remaining limitations. More reports may indicate easier reporting rather than greater harm, and a before/after difference alone does not establish that the action caused it.

□ Strong evidence
□ Some evidence
□ Early indication only
□ Not enough information yet

C. What changed in the partnership?

What evidence shows that coordination, responsibilities, information-sharing or community influence improved? Which relationships became stronger, and which gaps remain?

How confident are we in these findings?

Consider the relevance and consistency of the sources, coverage of affected groups and remaining limitations. More reports may indicate easier reporting rather than greater harm, and a before/after difference alone does not establish that the action caused it.

□ Strong evidence
□ Some evidence
□ Early indication only
□ Not enough information yet

CO-SECUR

Funded by the European Union

Canvas 5 - Result + Learning Canvas (continuation...)

D. LEARNING DECISIONS

KEEP	CHANGE	STOP	ADAPT	SHARE
What worked and should continue?	What needs improvement?	What added little value or caused harm?	What could transfer only after contextual adjustment?	Who needs the findings, and in what form?

What will be monitored next?

Which unresolved issue requires further action?

Do we need to return to Canvas 1? □ **Yes** □ **Not yet**

FOLLOW-UP
Responsible person/organization:
Next review date:
How communities will receive feedback:

Funded by
the European Union

CO-SECUR

Co-creating urban security solutions

CO-SECUR is a 3-year Horizon Europe project (2023-26) that aims to **improve citizens' security perception and behaviour in public spaces**, especially at large events and crowded areas, by actively engaging them to co-create innovative security solutions.

Visit our website: cosecur.eu

Scan me

Subscribe to the Newsletter

Follow us on LinkedIn

Follow us on YouTube

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. Grant Agreement no. 101121325