

B2

Safe Spaces Safeguarding Risk Assessment

For Erasmus+ and European Solidarity Corps Projects

Identify · Assess · Manage · Review

A Purpose and How to Use This Tool

This Safeguarding Risk Assessment supports organisations to **identify, assess and manage safeguarding risks** in Erasmus+ and European Solidarity Corps (ESC) projects. It should be read alongside the Safeguarding Policy Framework (F0) and the Annexes.

What is the purpose of this tool?

- Help organisations think systematically about safeguarding risks in a structured, evidence-based way.
- Support participatory reflection with staff, volunteers, partners and young people.
- Create a formal risk register for management and governance.
- Link risk identification to concrete action planning.
- Support continuous improvement and organisational learning.
- Demonstrate due diligence to funders, National Agencies and regulatory bodies.

When should this tool be used?

- **During project design and preparation:** identify risks before activities begin; ensure safeguarding is built into project design from the outset.
- **For ESC accreditation or organisational self-assessment:** demonstrate systematic safeguarding risk management.
- **Before specific activities:** conduct activity-specific risk assessments (training courses, mobility placements, residential events, online activities).
- **During implementation:** review and update risk assessments as circumstances change.
- **After project completion:** review what worked, what did not, and capture learning for future projects.

 **Important:** This tool is designed for integration into the regular project cycle, and not merely as a one-off compliance exercise. Safeguarding risk assessment is a legal and ethical obligation, not just a grant requirement — it operationalises the Do No Harm principle and supports accountability to participants, partners and funders.



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

References: UNCRC Art. 3 (best interests); Care Act 2014 (UK); GDPR Art. 35 (DPIA); CHS Core Humanitarian Standard (2024), Commitment 3; Erasmus+ Programme Guide — duty of care; IASC Investigators' Manual (IASC Expert Panel on SEAH Investigations, February 2025), s. 1.6 — risk and vulnerability factors.

B Who Should Use This Tool?

- 1. DSL, Alternate DSL and project coordinators** — to conduct formal risk assessments and maintain the internal risk register (Part 2).
- 2. Staff and volunteers** — to raise awareness through participatory reflection (Part 1). We recommend rolling out the tool through existing team activities to ensure understanding and provide support for follow-up.
- 3. Partner organisations** — to align safeguarding approaches and identify cross-border or cross-organisational risks (see Annex 8).
- 4. Young people and participants** — using adapted, youth-friendly formats in a safe, supported environment. Participation should focus on reflection and awareness-raising, not investigation or case management.

When involving young people:

- Appropriate facilitation by trained staff is required.
- Create a safe, confidential space for discussion.
- Be clear about what participants are being asked to do (reflection, not investigation).
- Communicate follow-up actions and act on them.
- Ensure participants are not placed in a position where they feel they must disclose personal experiences.

C Part 1 — Participatory Reflection: Questions and Context Mapping

This section is designed for **participatory, awareness-raising discussions** with staff, volunteers and, where appropriate, participants. It uses open questions and prompts to surface strengths, concerns and ideas for improvement.

C.1 Questions to Start the Conversation

Use these questions to open discussion. For each question, note: **what the question is designed to reveal**; suggested **means of verification** (data, observation or feedback sources); and **how answers will feed into the risk register** (Part 2).



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

1. What does “safeguarding” mean to you in the context of this project or activity?

- Purpose: gauge general awareness and establish a shared understanding.
- Means of verification: compare answers to the definition in FO/1; assess whether staff can describe reporting routes without prompting.

2. What do you think we are already doing well to keep participants safe?

- Purpose: identify strengths and build on what works.

3. What situations or contexts in this project might present risks to participants’ safety or wellbeing?

- Purpose: begin to identify risks without being overly prescriptive.
- Feed into: risk register (Part 2), columns 2–3.

4. Who do you think is most vulnerable or at risk in this project, and why?

- Purpose: encourage reflection on inclusion, power and context. High-risk activities or participant groups are those where there is an increased likelihood of safeguarding concerns, or where the potential impact of harm is greater.

5. If a participant had a concern or felt unsafe, do they know who to talk to and what would happen next?

- Purpose: check awareness of reporting routes and follow-up.
- Means of verification: ask participants directly (separately from staff); check participant-facing materials (Annex 9).

6. What could we do better to create a safe, respectful environment?

- Purpose: generate ideas for improvement.
- Feed into: risk register, column 8 (additional mitigation measures).

7. Are there any situations where you feel unsure about what to do or how to respond?

- Purpose: identify gaps in confidence, knowledge or procedures.
- Feed into: training plan; risk register, column 7 (existing controls) and column 8.

C.2 Mapping Risks in Different Contexts

Use these context-specific prompts in small-group discussions, workshops or individual reflection. For each context, capture: what are we already doing well? What risks or gaps exist? What could we do differently or better?

Context 1: Awareness and Understanding of Safeguarding

Prompts for reflection:

- Do all staff, volunteers and participants understand what safeguarding is?
- Do staff and volunteers know how to recognise signs of harm or distress?
- Do participants know their rights and how to report concerns?
- Is safeguarding discussed openly, or is it seen as a sensitive or avoided topic?
- Do staff feel confident responding to a disclosure or concern?

Example strengths:



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

- Safeguarding is included in induction for all staff and volunteers (mandatory, within first month).
- Participants receive youth-friendly safeguarding information (Annex 9) at the start of activities.
- The DSL and Alternate DSL are well-known and accessible to all staff and participants.

Example concerns:

- Some volunteers are unclear on reporting procedures.
- Safeguarding information is only provided in one language.
- Participants may not know who to contact outside office hours.

Example ideas for improvement:

- Provide regular refresher training (at least annually) for all staff and volunteers.
- Translate safeguarding information into all relevant languages.
- Display DSL contact details visibly in accommodation and activity spaces.

Context 2: Accommodation and Living Conditions (particularly relevant for ESC)**Prompts for reflection:**

- Are accommodation arrangements safe, private and appropriate?
- Do participants have secure, lockable private space?
- Are shared living arrangements appropriate and supervised?
- Do participants know how to report problems with accommodation (safety, harassment, cleanliness)?
- Is there support available if a participant feels unsafe in their accommodation?

Example strengths:

- Accommodation is inspected before participants arrive.
- Participants receive clear information about accommodation rules and emergency contacts.
- A 24/7 contact is available for urgent accommodation problems.

Example concerns:

- Some shared accommodation lacks adequate privacy.
- Participants may feel uncomfortable reporting issues with host families or flatmates.
- Accommodation safety checks are not documented.

Example ideas for improvement:

- Conduct mid-term accommodation check-ins or inspections; use a written checklist.
- Provide anonymous feedback channels for accommodation concerns.
- Document all accommodation safety checks and share with the DSL.

Context 3: Travel, Free Time and Unfamiliar Environments**Prompts for reflection:**

- Are participants adequately prepared for travel to unfamiliar locations?
- Do participants know how to stay safe during free time and outside structured activities?
- Are there appropriate boundaries and supervision during travel and free time?



- Do participants have emergency contacts and know what to do if problems arise?
- Are risks associated with alcohol, nightlife or risky activities addressed in briefings?

Example strengths:

- Pre-departure orientation includes travel safety and cultural preparation.
- Participants receive emergency contact cards with local helplines and project contacts.
- Staff accompany participants during initial arrival and orientation.

Example concerns:

- Participants may be unsure how to navigate public transport safely in a new country.
- There is limited supervision or support during evenings and weekends.
- Cultural differences in social norms (alcohol, relationships) are not discussed.

Example ideas for improvement:

- Provide clear guidelines on free time, curfews (if applicable) and expected behaviour.
- Offer optional structured activities during free time to reduce isolation.
- Facilitate peer support groups or buddy systems among participants.

Context 4: Power Imbalances and Relationships

Prompts for reflection:

- Are boundaries between staff, mentors and participants clear and understood?
- Could staff, mentors or supervisors misuse their position of power?
- Are participants able to challenge or report concerns about staff behaviour without fear?
- Are there risks of favouritism, inappropriate relationships or abuse of power?
- Do staff and volunteers understand what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate behaviour?

Example strengths:

- A Code of Conduct (Annex 2) clearly defines professional boundaries, with examples of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour.
- Staff and volunteers receive training on power dynamics, grooming indicators and appropriate relationships, using the training benchmarks referenced in Annex 1.
- Participants know they can report concerns to the DSL, Alternate DSL, a different staff member, or an external helpline.

Example concerns:

- Some mentors develop overly close personal relationships with participants (see Code of Conduct, Annex 2, footnotes ¹⁻³ for definitions and examples of inappropriate closeness).
- Participants may feel unable to challenge a supervisor or host organisation staff member.
- There is no clear process for declaring conflicts of interest or personal relationships between staff and participants.

Example ideas for improvement:

- Include explicit guidance and examples on boundaries in staff and volunteer training (see Annex 2, Section 3.2).

- Ensure participants know they can report concerns to an independent contact: this could be a trustee or board member (independent of staff), a social worker, or an external safeguarding advisor.
- Implement a policy on declaring conflicts of interest and personal relationships, with specific consequences for non-disclosure (see Annex 2, Section 3.8).

Context 5: Inclusion, Discrimination and Vulnerability

Prompts for reflection:

- Are participants with additional needs or vulnerabilities identified and supported?
- Is discrimination (racist, sexist, homophobic, transphobic, ableist) recognised and challenged?
- Do all participants feel included and valued?
- Is safeguarding information accessible to participants with diverse needs (language, literacy, disability)?
- Are there adequate support measures for participants who may be at higher risk?

Example strengths:

- The organisation has a strong commitment to inclusion and non-discrimination (see Annex 3).
- Additional support is provided to participants with identified needs, including: designated support persons; accessible activity spaces; materials in different formats; and reasonable adjustments on request.
- Incidents of discrimination are taken seriously, recorded and addressed.

Example concerns:

- Some participants may not disclose needs due to stigma or fear.
- Discrimination may be dismissed as “banter” or “cultural difference”.
- Safeguarding materials are not available in Easy Read or accessible formats.

Example ideas for improvement:

- Conduct confidential needs assessments before activities: ask participants about support needs during registration; follow up individually; document support plans. Means of verification: feedback surveys; project evaluations; individual check-ins.
- Provide training on recognising and challenging discrimination.
- Develop accessible, multi-format safeguarding information (see Annex 9).

Context 6: Online and Digital Spaces

Prompts for reflection:

- Are there clear guidelines on acceptable use of social media and messaging apps?
- Do staff and volunteers maintain appropriate boundaries in online communication with participants?
- Are risks of cyberbullying, harassment or inappropriate contact addressed?
- Is consent sought before taking or sharing photos and videos?
- Do participants know how to report online safeguarding concerns?

Example strengths:



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

- Staff use official group channels for communication; personal messaging to individual participants is not permitted except in specific documented circumstances (see Annex 2, footnote ⁷ for examples).
- Participants sign a social media and photo consent form at registration.
- The organisation has a clear policy on photo and video use, including GDPR compliance.

Example concerns:

- Some staff communicate with participants via personal social media accounts.
- There is no guidance on appropriate times or frequency for online contact.
- Cyberbullying among participants is not monitored or addressed.

Example ideas for improvement:

- Implement digital safeguarding guidelines for staff (see Annex 2, Section 3.3 and Annex 4, Section 7).
- Use moderated online platforms with reporting functions.
- Include online safeguarding in induction, training and participant briefings.

C.3 Capturing and Using the Results

After participatory reflection, it is critical that findings are **documented, shared and translated into formal risks** in the risk register (Part 2). This is not optional — it is the mechanism by which reflection becomes accountability.

1. **Document the findings:** record strengths, concerns and ideas using flip charts, sticky notes, shared documents or a capture form.
2. **Share back with participants:** summarise what was said and check it reflects their views accurately.
3. **Prioritise concerns:** which are most urgent? Which are easiest to address quickly? Which require longer-term planning?
4. **Agree actions:** who will do what, by when? What resources or support are needed?
5. **Feed into the formal risk register (Part 2) — REQUIRED:** every concern identified in participatory reflection that cannot be resolved immediately must be entered into the risk register. This is the single most important follow-up action.
6. **Follow up:** review actions at team meetings; communicate progress to participants.

D Part 2 — Internal Safeguarding Risk Register

This section provides a **formal, structured approach to risk assessment**, primarily for use by the DSL, Alternate DSL, project coordinators and senior management.

 **External reference:** The Safeguarding Resource and Support Hub (RSH) provides a risk assessment and management tool in Excel format that is widely used across the



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

sector: <https://safeguardingsupporthub.org> — this is a useful complement to the register below, particularly for organisations already using Excel-based risk management systems.

D.1 Structure of the Risk Register

Column	Description
Risk ID	Unique identifier for each risk (e.g. R-01, R-02, R-03).
Risk description	Clear, concise description of the risk.
Context	Where/when this risk arises (e.g. accommodation, travel, online, recruitment).
Likelihood (1–5)	How likely is this risk to occur? 1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely.
Impact (1–5)	If it occurs, how serious would the consequences be? 1 = minimal; 5 = severe.
Risk rating	Likelihood × Impact. Low: 1–4; Medium: 5–9; High: 10–14; Urgent: 15+.
Existing controls	Measures already in place to reduce this risk.
Additional mitigation	Further concrete actions needed to reduce the risk to an acceptable level.
Responsible person	Who is accountable for implementing each mitigation measure.
Target date	When actions should be completed (use "target date" not "deadline").
Status	Not started / In progress / Completed.
Review date	When this risk will next be reviewed.
Notes	Additional information, updates or follow-up actions.

D.2 Risk Areas and Example Risks

Below are seven key risk areas with example risks and mitigation measures. Adapt and add risks based on your own context.

Risk area 1: Awareness and culture

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-01	Staff and volunteers lack awareness of safeguarding policy and procedures	General	3	4	12 (High)	Policy available	Make induction mandatory; annual refresher; include safeguarding in team meetings.
R-02	Participants do not know how	General	4	4	16 (High)	Basic welcome pack	Develop Annex 9 leaflet; present at start of each



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

	to report concerns						activity; display contacts visibly.
R-03	No regular safeguarding training for staff, trustees or volunteers	General	4	5	20 (Urgent)	Ad-hoc briefings	Develop training plan; mandatory induction within first month; schedule annual refresher.
R-04	Safeguarding concerns dismissed or not taken seriously	General	2	5	10 (Medium)	DSL in place	Leadership zero-tolerance statement; clear whistleblowing routes; monitor culture through feedback.
R-05	Poor culture where people are afraid to raise concerns	General	2	5	10 (Medium)	Open door policy	Confidential reporting channels; external safeguarding advisor; regular anonymous surveys.

Risk area 2: Policies and procedures

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1-5)	Impact (1-5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-06	Safeguarding policy out of date or does not reflect current activities	General	3	3	9 (Medium)	Policy last reviewed 2023	Set 2-3-year review cycle; update after major incidents or programme changes.
R-07	No clear written procedures for responding to disclosures or allegations	General	3	5	15 (High)	Informal practice only	Develop step-by-step procedures; include flow charts; share with all staff and volunteers.
R-08	No guidance on when to inform National Agencies or funders	General	3	4	12 (High)	Grant agreements on file	Add NA/funder reporting criteria to procedures; assign responsibility (DSL/Coordinator).
R-09	Inconsistent safeguarding approaches across partner organisations	Partnership	4	4	16 (High)	Policies shared informally	Use Annex 8 Partnership Agreement; agree minimum standards; review at partnership meetings.

Risk area 3: Reporting, recording and confidentiality



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-10	Staff and participants do not know how to report concerns	General	4	4	16 (High)	DSL named in policy	Display reporting routes in all venues; include in induction; add to participant materials.
R-11	Staff uncertain about confidentiality limits in safeguarding cases	General	3	3	9 (Medium)	General clause in policy	Clarify in training; include examples (see Annex 2, footnote 5); remind staff not to promise absolute confidentiality.
R-12	Safeguarding concerns not recorded consistently	General	3	4	12 (High)	Ad-hoc notes	Introduce standard incident form (Annex 6, Part A); train staff; audit records periodically.
R-13	Safeguarding records not stored securely (GDPR risk)	General	2	4	8 (Medium)	DSL keeps files	Use Identity Index model (Annex 6, Part C); locked cabinet or encrypted digital folder; restrict access; define retention periods (Annex 5).

Risk area 4: Recruitment and supervision

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-14	Recruitment does not explore safeguarding awareness or attitudes	Recruitment	3	4	12 (High)	Standard interviews	Add safeguarding questions to interviews; assess boundaries, equality and past behaviour with young people.
R-15	No criminal record checks or alternative screening for high-risk roles	Recruitment	4	5	20 (Urgent)	Basic references only	Introduce checks where legally possible; where not, use extra references, probation and closer



							supervision (Misconduct Disclosure Scheme: misconduct-disclosure-scheme.org).
R-16	Limited supervision of staff, volunteers or mentors	Ongoing	3	4	12 (High)	Quarterly team meetings	Schedule regular 1-to-1 supervision; include safeguarding as standing agenda; provide mentor support.
R-17	Mentors lack safeguarding training or support	ESC/mentoring	4	4	16 (High)	Informal briefing only	Create mentor training including safeguarding; provide written guidance; offer a contact point for mentors to raise concerns.

Risk area 5: Accommodation, working conditions and free time

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-18	Accommodation does not meet safety or privacy standards	Accommodation/ESC	2	5	10 (Medium)	Informal checks	Use a written inspection checklist; inspect before placements; re-check mid-stay; respond quickly to concerns.
R-19	Participants lack support or supervision during free time or weekends	Free time	3	3	9 (Medium)	24/7 emergency phone	Provide clear guidelines on free time; offer optional structured activities; ensure participants know who to contact.
R-20	Inadequate supervision or unclear rules in shared accommodation	Accommodation/ESC	2	4	8 (Medium)	House rules mentioned verbally	Provide written house rules; discuss at arrival; clarify expectations on visitors, quiet hours and alcohol.
R-21	Participants assigned inappropriate, unsafe or	Working conditions	2	4	8 (Medium)	Task descriptions agreed in application	Review tasks regularly; encourage participants to give feedback;



	exploitative work tasks						intervene and renegotiate if concerns arise.
--	-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Risk area 6: Online and digital safeguarding

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-22	No guidelines on acceptable use of social media or messaging apps	Online	4	3	12 (High)	Informal norms	Develop digital safeguarding guidelines; integrate into Code of Conduct (Annex 2, Section 3.3); share with participants.
R-23	Staff/volunteers use private social media or late-night messaging with participants	Online	3	4	12 (High)	None	Require use of official channels only; set time boundaries; prohibit personal "friending" during projects (Annex 2, footnote 4).
R-24	Cyberbullying or harassment between participants not monitored or addressed	Online	3	3	9 (Medium)	None	Include online behaviour in ground rules; provide reporting route; intervene promptly.
R-25	Photos/videos taken or shared without informed consent	Online/activities	3	3	9 (Medium)	Ad-hoc consent	Use clear consent forms; explain uses; allow opt-out; brief staff not to post images on personal accounts (Annex 4, Section 10).

Risk area 7: Inclusion and vulnerability

Risk ID	Risk description	Context	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk rating	Existing controls	Additional mitigation measures
R-26	Participants' additional needs or vulnerabilities not identified or supported	Inclusion	3	4	12 (High)	General registration form	Add confidential needs assessment at registration; discuss support plans; review mid-project. Means of verification: feedback surveys,



							project evaluations, individual interviews.
R-27	Discrimination not recognised or challenged	Activities	2	4	8 (Medium)	Non-discrimination clause	Provide EDI training; set clear behaviour rules; record and act on all incidents (see Annex 3).
R-28	Safeguarding information not accessible to participants with diverse needs	General	3	3	9 (Medium)	English-only written info	Translate key materials; produce Easy Read/visual versions; use verbal explanations (see Annex 9).
R-29	Insufficient planning for participants with disabilities or health conditions	Inclusion	2	4	8 (Medium)	Case-by-case adaptations	Conduct accessibility checks on venues and accommodation; plan reasonable adjustments; liaise with participants in advance.

D.3 How to Use the Risk Register

7. **Identify risks:** use findings from participatory reflection (Part 1); consult staff, participants and partners; review incident logs and feedback.
8. **Assess likelihood and impact:** score each risk (1–5); calculate rating ($L \times I$); prioritise high-rated risks.
9. **Document existing controls:** what are you already doing to manage this risk? Are existing controls adequate?
10. **Identify additional mitigation measures:** be specific and concrete. Avoid vague actions like "raise awareness" or "provide training" without specifying who, when and how.
11. **Assign responsibility and target dates:** who will lead each action? Use "target date" rather than "deadline". What resources or support are needed?
12. **Monitor, review and update:** review at least quarterly and at project milestones. Update status and notes. Add new risks as they emerge. Review after any incident.

E Part 3 — Linking Reflection to Action

Identifying risks is only the first step. The next step is **translating risks into concrete actions** and ensuring accountability.



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

E.1 From Risk to Action Plan

For each identified risk, use these questions to develop an action plan:

Question	Example answer
What concrete steps will we take?	"Develop a youth-friendly safeguarding leaflet in 3 languages (using Annex 9 template)."
Who is responsible?	"DSL, with input from the youth advisory group."
By when? (target date)	Before the next mobility activity.
What resources or support are needed?	"Budget for translation and design (€500); graphic designer."
How will we know it's working?	"Participants can describe reporting routes in the project evaluation survey."
Who needs to be informed?	"Project partners, National Agency, participants."

E.2 Feeding Into Wider Systems

Safeguarding risk assessment should feed into:

- **Organisation's wider risk register:** safeguarding must be part of overall governance, not a parallel system.
- **Project-specific risk management:** inform individual activity, placement or mobility risk assessments.
- **Training plans:** highlight areas where staff, volunteers or contractors need additional training.
- **Partnership agreements:** clarify shared responsibilities and mitigation measures across partners (Annex 8).
- **Policy review:** identify where policies or procedures need updating.
- **Organisational learning:** capture lessons learned and good practices to share with the sector.

E.3 Action Tracking Template

Use this table to monitor progress on actions agreed during risk assessment. Update status at each review. These templates are also available as a separate sheet in the Excel version of this tool.

Action	Responsible person	Target date	Status	Notes
Develop youth-friendly safeguarding leaflet in 3 languages	DSL + youth advisory group	[Before next activity]	In progress	Translation underway
Conduct accommodation safety inspection	Project Coordinator	[Before each placement]	Not started	Checklist needed
Provide safeguarding training	DSL + external trainer	[Insert date]	Completed	15 staff trained



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

--	--	--	--	--

F Formats and Tools

- **Fillable document (Word or PDF):** suitable for one-off or small-scale assessments. Complete electronically; save and share with colleagues; print for paper-based filing.
- **Excel or Google Sheets spreadsheet:** recommended for ongoing internal risk registers. Pre-structured with formulas and drop-down menus; automatic risk rating calculations; filtering and sorting; risk heat map. See also the RSH Nigeria Risk Register template: <https://safeguardingsupporthub.org>
- **Interactive online form (Typeform, Microsoft Forms, Google Forms):** for collecting input from multiple staff or partners; auto-generates a summary report; tracks changes over time.
- **Participatory worksheets:** large-format worksheets or flip charts; sticky notes or cards; visual prompts and images; facilitation guides for youth workers. Suitable for workshops, team meetings and induction sessions.

G Integration with Safeguarding Policy Framework

Safeguarding Policy Framework (F0)	This Risk Assessment Tool (R0)
Sets out the organisation's commitments, roles, procedures and standards.	Identifies and manages specific risks in practice.
The "what" and "why" of safeguarding.	The "how": practical implementation and continuous improvement.

Workflow:

13. **Adopt or adapt the Policy Framework (F0)** to your organisation.
14. **Use Part 1 (participatory reflection)** to identify strengths, gaps and priorities.
15. **Enter key concerns into Part 2 (risk register)** and develop action plans.
16. **Review and update both documents regularly** — at project milestones, after incidents and at annual review.

H Checklist for Effective Risk Assessment

Before completing your safeguarding risk assessment, confirm:

- **The right people are involved:** DSL, Alternate DSL, project coordinators, staff, volunteers, young people (where appropriate), partners.



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

- **Participants are included safely:** appropriate facilitation, formats and support are in place.
- **All key risk areas are considered:** awareness, policies, reporting, recruitment, accommodation, online, inclusion, partnerships.
- **Risks are scored realistically:** based on likelihood and impact, not just compliance optics.
- **Existing controls are documented:** recognising what is already working.
- **Mitigation measures are specific and concrete:** not just "raise awareness" or "provide training" without detail.
- **Responsibilities and target dates are clear:** someone is accountable for each action.
- **Actions are resourced and realistic:** consider time, budget and expertise.
- **Results are communicated:** to staff, participants, partners, Board and all relevant stakeholders.
- **Review dates are set:** this is a living document, not a one-off exercise.

I Summary: Using This Tool for Continuous Improvement

Safeguarding risk assessment is not a tick-box exercise. It is a dynamic, ongoing process that supports learning, accountability and continuous improvement.

This tool works best when:

17. **It is embedded in the project cycle:** used at planning, implementation and evaluation stages, not just once.
18. **It involves diverse perspectives:** staff, volunteers, participants, partners all contribute.
19. **It leads to action:** risks identified are linked to concrete measures, responsibilities and target dates.
20. **It is reviewed and updated:** as projects evolve, new risks emerge, and mitigation measures are tested.
21. **It feeds into organisational culture:** risk assessment contributes to a culture of openness, accountability and learning.

Safeguarding is everyone's responsibility. This tool supports organisations to make that responsibility practical, systematic and embedded in everything they do.

 **Language note:** Throughout this tool, we use the term "**target date**" rather than "deadline". This reflects the action-oriented, dynamic spirit of safeguarding risk assessment: target dates build a sense of purpose and progress; deadlines build dread. Small changes in language support a culture of ownership and accountability.



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

References: CHS Core Humanitarian Standard (2024), Commitments 3 and 5; NSPCC Safeguarding Standards, Standards 1 and 2;
IASC Investigators' Manual (IASC Expert Panel on SEAH Investigations, February 2025), s. 6.4 — learning cycle;
Safeguarding Resource and Support Hub (RSH): <https://safeguardingsupporthub.org>



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu

© Safe Spaces, 2026. This material is released under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence (CC BY 4.0). Permission is granted to utilize, modify, and translate these resources for organizational use, provided the Safe Spaces project is formally credited. Access the complete toolkit at www.safe-spaces.eu.

Financial support provided by the European Union. Production of this document by the European Commission does not imply endorsement of the material; the perspectives expressed belong solely to the authors. Neither the National Agency nor the Commission accepts liability for any application of the information provided.



Funded by
the European Union

www.safe-spaces.eu