

Chapter 3 – Tool 3: Green and red flags in organizational OGBV response

Organisations and their internal policies play a crucial role in shaping how OGBV is prevented, recognised, and responded to in youth and digital spaces. The table below presents a simple but practical set of green and red flags that can help youth organisations and NGOs, reflect on the strengths and gaps in their own approaches to OGBV¹. **Green flags** indicate policies and practices that are survivor-centred, rights-based, and proactive, while **red flags** highlight common warning signs such as silence, ambiguity, and exclusion that can leave young people more vulnerable and unsupported when online abuse occurs.

Area	Green flags	Red flags
Commitment and policy	Explicit, published policy on OGBV that aligns with gender equality and human rights standards and is co-developed with all staff and the affected groups.	No dedicated policy on OGBV or digital safety; only vague “cyberbullying” or “misconduct” rules that ignore gender based and intersectional dimensions.
Definitions and scope	Clear, inclusive definitions of OGBV (e.g., cyber stalking, image-based abuse, hate speech) that acknowledge the online	Definitions are narrow (e.g., “harassment” only) or absent, leaving forms like doxxing, nonconsensual image

¹ European Institute for Gender Equality. (2023b). *Gender analysis*. <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/tools-methods/gender-analysis>

GenderSAFE. (2025a). *Preview of the GenderSAFE institutional self-assessment tool*. <https://yellowwindow.eu/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Preview-Final-14Oct2025.pdf>

United Nations Development Programme [UNDP]. (2025). *Global action against online gender-based violence: Making digital spaces safe*. <https://www.undp.org/press-releases/making-digital-spaces-safe-global-action-against-online-gender-based-violence>

Women’s Rights Online. (2023). *OGBV: Policies and data*. <https://www.womensrightsonline.net/ogbv/overview>

European Commission. (n.d.). *Legal framework of EU data protection*. https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-topic/data-protection/legal-framework-eu-data-protection_en

Information Commissioner’s Office. (2024). *A guide to the data protection principles*. <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/data-protection-principles/a-guide-to-the-data-protection-principles>

Saferworld. (n.d.). *Guide to trauma-informed approach in youth work*.

	offline continuum and diverse identities.	sharing, or coordinated trolling outside the scope of protection.
Staff training and culture	Mandatory, regular training for all staff and volunteers on OGBV, digital safety, trauma informed practice, and bystander intervention.	Staff report feeling “unprepared” or “unsure” how to respond to online abuse, and training is infrequent or limited.
Reporting and response	Multiple, accessible, and low threshold reporting channels (online and offline), with clear timelines, survivor centred procedures, and follow up for the person who reports.	Reporting is complex, requires technical skills, lacks feedback, or is ignored/delayed; survivors are told “just block them” without real support.
Confidentiality and data protection	Strong data protection and confidentiality rules aligned with EU style standards (e.g., GDPR informed), with clear explanations to young people about how their data is used and protected.	Little or no documentation on how personal data or evidence of abuse is stored, shared, or removed; staff store screenshots or stories in unsecured, shared folders.
Accountability and oversight	Regular monitoring and evaluation of OGBV incidents and responses, including feedback from survivors, and transparent reporting to boards or governing bodies.	No system to track OGBV cases, no protection from retaliation for those who report, and no way to hold perpetrators or negligent staff accountable.
Inclusion and intersectionality	Policies and practices explicitly address how identity (gender, disability, migration status, sexuality, race) shapes risk and access to support, and protect marginalised voices from censorship under “security” pretexts.	Rules are one size fits all, assume “neutral” users, and disproportionately silence or punish marginalised groups (e.g., through over broad content moderation or surveillance style “protection”).

Partnerships and advocacy	Collaboration with GBV, digital rights, and youth led organisations to strengthen prevention, response, and policy change; public commitment to safe online spaces.	Isolated silos, no partnerships with women's rights or digital rights actors, and no public stance on combating online GBV, even when the organisation operates heavily online.
----------------------------------	--	--