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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms &amp; Abbreviations</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCPC</td>
<td>Barangay Council for the Protection of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEM</td>
<td>Child Sexual Exploitation Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICT</td>
<td>Department of Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSWD</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJM</td>
<td>International Justice Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JST</td>
<td>Justice System Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBF</td>
<td>The Kaisahang Buhay Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Government Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMEC</td>
<td>National Center for Missing &amp; Exploited Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>National Capital Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSEC</td>
<td>Online Sexual Exploitation of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICACC</td>
<td>Philippine Internet Crimes Against Children Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRPTP</td>
<td>Recovery and Reintegration Program for Trafficked Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSN</td>
<td>Reintegration Support Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Trafficking in Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions of Terms

**Aftercare**
for International Justice Mission (IJM) and the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), this is the team of social workers who provide services to aftercare participants, from rescue to reintegration.

**Aftercare Participant**
refers to any person formally enrolled in an IJM Aftercare program.

**Online Sexual Exploitation of Children**
refers to a broad category of online sex offending that includes, but is not limited to, possession or distribution of previously produced child sexual exploitation material (CSEM), enticing children to “self-produce” new CSEM, and grooming children for later contact abuse.

**Child Sexual Exploitation Material**
refers to “any visual or audio (and/or any combination thereof) representation of minors under the age of 18 engaged in sexual activity or of minors engaging in lewd or erotic behavior recorded, produced and/or published to arouse the viewer’s sexual interest.” (IJM, 2020, p.7)

**Child Sexual Violence**
a sexual act that is committed against a child without his/her consent. This can include taking photos or videos of nudity or sexual activities, unwanted touch, forced attempted sex, and forced consummated sex that occurs before the child is 18 years of age (Council for the Welfare of Children & United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund [UNICEF], 2016).

**Perpetrator**
a person who is alleged to have committed an act of online sexual exploitation of children that led to his/her arrest.

**Reintegration**
pertains to “the process of moving from an environment or situation of exploitation to one where the child has the same opportunities as other children.” (Cody, 2017, p. 22). In this definition, reintegration may involve returning to the child’s immediate or extended non-offending family and community, or integration with an adoptive family and/or in a new community (Rafferty, 2019; Surtees, 2013).

**Restoration**
a measurable improvement in the condition of an Aftercare Participant from the time of initial assessment until the completion of his/her Treatment Plan, such that the Participant is able to function satisfactorily in society with low vulnerability to re-victimization (International Justice Mission [IJM], 2012).
**Service Provider**
is a social service/welfare agency/organization, government or non-government, which is directly responsible for the delivery of services to trafficked persons (Department of Social Welfare and Development [DSWD], n.d.a).
“We need to go to the lowland if we want to finish our studies – that is my only dream, which my perpetrator leveraged to exploit me.”
I am a Manobo from far-flung, beautiful, and peaceful mountain of Surigao Del Sur. As a tribe we do things together: we farm, fish, and harvest our food. Life as a child is happy with my kin; it’s simple but all our needs are provided for, as our elders and parents trained us to do the things that will help us survive. Most of our elders and parents were not able to go to school, it is also a problem for us children because we need to go to the lowland if we want to finish our studies – that is my only dream, which my perpetrator leveraged to exploit me.

I was in grade 3, aged 12, when a neighbor’s nephew from the lowland asked me to be a house helper in Manila in exchange for my studies. My desire to achieve my dreams, which my parents also supported, though they didn’t have the capacity to provide for it, compelled me to agree. My perpetrator introduced me as his child to his friend. I even called him “tatay” (father). For the first four months, it was a complete transformation for me as a “Manobo” — he taught me how to fix myself up and dress-up, which made me feel beautiful and good about myself. He sent me to a private school. He bought me dresses and all the material things that I needed.

It all started with a “wave” and a “hi” to his foreign friends in the webcam, but it soon became regular. After school at 3:00 he would let me sleep, wake me up at around 7:00 in the morning.

1 Manobo – An indigenous people in the Philippines that means “people of the river.” Manobos are concentrated in Agusan, Bukidnon, Cotabato, Davao, Misamis Oriental, and Surigao Del Sur. The Manobo usually build their villages near small bodies of water or forest clearings, although they also opt for hillsides, rivers, valleys, and plateaus. The communities are small, consisting of only 4-12 houses. They practice slash-and-burn agriculture.
the evening, and the session would last up until 3:00 in the morning with up to ten different foreign customers. There were also customers who came to the Philippines and took me to different hotels. My perpetrator was strict, I was not allowed to talk to anyone, he brought food and picked me after school. If I didn’t follow his instructions, he hit me and if I cried, would beat me more. I could no longer concentrate on my studies, which made me sad.

It was eleven years of this ordeal and not seeing my family. I am thankful to God that I am rescued, not only for myself, but also for my other five companions, especially the one-year-old girl. Now, I persevere all the more to finish my studies so I can go back to my tribe to educate them about exploitation and our rights as children. I ask help for all the indigenous people in the Philippines whose ignorance of the law and the city life has made us easy and helpless prey for exploiters.

“I ask help for all the indigenous people in the Philippines whose ignorance of the law and the city life has made us easy and helpless prey for exploiters.”
Online sexual exploitation of children is a rampantly growing global crime, particularly in the Philippines which is known as the “global hotspot” of OSEC cases (IJM, 2020, p. 60) and ranked amongst the top ten producers of child sexual exploitation material (CSEM) (UNICEF, 2017a). Online sexual exploitation of children refers to a broad category of online sex offending that includes, but is not limited to, possession or distribution of previously produced CSEM, enticing children to “self-produce” new CSEM, and grooming children for later contact abuse. The unique nature and demographics of victims and perpetrators of this form of abuse which include the very young age of children victimized, the overwhelming number of families directly involved in the crime, the acceptance and tolerance of this form of exploitation in communities involved, as well as the high-risk for potential re-victimization of victims, present challenges in aftercare support, particularly in reintegration of survivors. In addressing the issues of online child sexual abuse, the preventive, protective, and supportive interventions for children should be extended to families and communities who are the key players in perpetrating this crime (ASEAN, 2016; UNICEF East Asian Pacific Regional Office [EAPRO], 2016; United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime [UNODC], 2015). This holistic approach is fundamental to ensuring survivor’s restoration, sustained recovery, and successful reintegration.

This study examined the environmental context – individual, family, community, and societal level – of the survivors to: (1) provide a comprehensive understanding of the risk factors that facilitate online sexual exploitation of children in individuals (victims), families, and communities
impacted by this form of abuse, and determine gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services for survivors; (2) determine the factors that contribute to successful reintegration of survivors including the interventions and support services that need to be provided at each level of system. And lastly, (3) identify alternative care options for survivors who cannot be reintegrated to their family and community.

Employing a qualitative approach, key informant questionnaires were distributed to 55 respondents composed of 19 non-offending family members and 18 neighbors of selected Aftercare Participants including 18 service providers that have knowledge of and involvement with survivors of online sexual exploitation. Further, five focus group discussions among government and non-government service providers with a total of 40 participants from NCR, Region IV-A, Region III, and Region VII were conducted. These areas represent the regions with the highest number of IJM online sexual exploitation of children clients in 2018.

Findings determined the following key risk factors that facilitate online sexual exploitation of children in individuals (victims), families, and communities involved in this form of abuse. Common themes that emerged are:

- **Easy money perception of livestreamed child sexual exploitation and poverty.**
- **Lack of knowledge and awareness about online sexual exploitation of children.** Victims and perpetrators are unaware that this form of abuse is a crime punishable by law, and they have a distorted belief that it is non-abusive and harmless. This lack of knowledge and awareness resulted in the acceptance and tolerance of this activity in communities engaged in this form of exploitation.
- **Access to internet and technology and English language proficiency.** Availability of “resources” such as access to affordable phones/laptops and internet and the Filipinos ability to speak English well that makes communication with foreigners easy were utilized to engage in livestreamed child sexual exploitation.
- **Neglect of parental role and responsibilities of primary caregiver.** This theme described families involved in this form of abuse as dysfunctional, neglectful, and those who lack knowledge on responsible parenthood. Filipino family values such as the concept of *utang na loob* and parental authority were used to appeal to the child’s sense of obligation to help the family.
- **Survivor’s perception about victimization.** Survivors have no realization that they are victims, instead they view this form of exploitation as acceptable, harmless, and economically beneficial since they were able to contribute to the needs of their family. Failure or refusal to acknowledge themselves as victims was determined to be one of the major challenges in providing interventions for survivors because there are no signs or manifestations of trauma compared to other forms of abuse. The
trauma for the children is not the crime itself but their separation from their family.

Further, gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services for survivors were determined. These are also potential risk factors that may cause reintegrated survivors susceptible to re-victimization. Gaps identified were lack of comprehensive assessment, lack of community-based intervention, lack of community-based monitoring post-reintegration, and lack of capacity of local government to intervene. All of these were attributed to the insufficient number of LGU social workers, lack of capacity, knowledge, and skills of service providers to properly conduct assessment and case management, and lack of funds and resources allocated to implement and sustain reintegration programs and services.

For the second objective, results highlighted the following factors that support the successful reintegration of survivors:

• Comprehensive pre-reintegration assessment and planning
• Availability and delivery of comprehensive community-based intervention
• Continuous follow-up and monitoring
• Efficient mechanism on prevention and reporting of online sexual exploitation of children
• Interagency coordination

Lastly, a brief discussion on alternative permanent and temporary placement options for survivors who cannot be reintegrated to their family and community was provided. Independent living for those who are 18 years old and above and kinship care for children were identified as the most viable permanent options for survivors whose reintegration with their biological family is not possible.

Findings emphasized the importance of providing separate and tailored interventions for the individual, family, and community to attain restoration and ensure the successful reintegration of survivors. Key recommendations include the need to:

• Increase capacity-building opportunities for non-government and government services providers.
• Ensure comprehensive and holistic delivery of community-based interventions and services to survivors and their families.
• Ensure that regular monitoring and evaluation of reintegrated survivors and their families are implemented.
• Strengthen advocacy efforts and awareness-building about online sexual exploitation of children in communities.
• Allocate more funds to implement and sustain reintegration programs and increase the number of LGU social workers.
• Strengthen and expand the foster care and independent living program.

Future studies may delve into the unique
needs of OSEC survivors as well as identify the barriers and challenges they encounter in accessing the support services they need to attain restoration and ensure successful reintegration. Additionally, an in-depth analysis on the challenges affecting the service providers’ capacity to provide services and interventions to children survivors of online sexual exploitation including recommendations to address these gaps and barriers may also be conducted.
International Justice Mission (IJM) has responded to the rapid increase of online sexual exploitation of children through its Casework and System Reform program (IJM, 2016) and Justice System Transformation (JST) intervention model (IJM, 2017), which aims to empower partners to provide aftercare services to child victims and prosecute perpetrators in the Philippines. This program seeks to develop a contextualized model of case management that will significantly and sustainably address victimization and improve restoration outcomes for children survivors of online sexual exploitation.

This study supports IJM Aftercare as it works to improve the condition of survivors in the areas of protection, trauma recovery, economic empowerment, housing, health, and education to attain restoration and to transition to safe and sustainable living environment. This refers to a decreased vulnerability to victimization and an ability to function with minimal assistance from IJM Aftercare and partner organizations (IJM, 2012). This report aims to provide intervention options for Aftercare in facilitating successful reintegration of survivors.

In the implementation of its minimum standards of care, IJM Aftercare attests that the rise of online sexual exploitation of children crimes in the Philippines calls for a comprehensive and holistic set of care options which address the unique needs of the survivors. The younger average age of children, the number of perpetrating families, and the kind of engagement of community members in this crime against children present challenges in aftercare support, particularly in reintegration. IJM has found that home assessments prior to reintegration do
not currently include sufficient analysis to determine safe placement options or reintegration support services that will appropriately respond to the needs of survivors. IJM Aftercare also believes that the high percentage of child victims who are abused by close relatives or members of the local community will result in a greater likelihood of re-victimization, creating the need for an intervention with greater involvement of the family and local community. Largely, there is a lack of capacity for reintegration support and services for survivors of online sexual exploitation outside of IJM operations in the Philippines.

By employing a qualitative approach and using the lens of ecological systems theory, this study examined the environmental context – individual, family, community, and societal level – of online sexual exploitation of children survivors to: (1) provide a comprehensive understanding of the risk factors that facilitate this form exploitation in children, families, and communities impacted by this abuse, and determine gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services for survivors; (2) determine the factors that contribute to the successful reintegration of survivors including the interventions and support services that need to be provided at each level of system. And lastly, (3) identify alternative care options for survivors who cannot be reintegrated to their family and community.
Nature of Online Sexual Exploitation of Children in the Philippines

The Philippines is known as the “global hotspot” of online sexual exploitation of children cases (IJM, 2020, p.60) and ranked amongst the top ten producers of child sexual exploitation material (CSEM) (UNICEF, 2017a). Despite being classified as a Tier 1 of the US Department’s Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report since 2016, online sexual abuse remains rampant and it continuously proliferates in the country. According to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC) 2019 report, the Philippines received 801,272 CyberTipline reports on online child exploitation. This is a sharp increase compared to 2018 with 600,000 reports, 2017 with 45,645, and 37,715 in 2016. However, it is difficult to determine if this rise in reporting is associated with actual increase in offending, thus the true numbers or prevalence of online sexual exploitation of children cases remains unknown (IJM, 2020).

As articulated in Article 19 of the United Nations’ Convention of the Rights of Children (CRC), online sexual exploitation of children is an emerging issue that violates the right of children to be protected from abuse and exploitation (UN, 1990). This crime against children is considered an act of sexual violence comprising of sexual activity or attempted sexual activity imposed by an adult on a child, causing harm and hindering the development of the child’s full potential as a human being (ASEAN, 2016). There are several laws aimed at combatting online child sexual abuse in the Philippines, these include: the Cybercrime Prevention Act of 2012, Expanded Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2012, the Special Protection of Children

In this report, online sexual exploitation of children refers to a broad category of online sex offending that includes, but is not limited to, possession or distribution of previously produced child sexual exploitation material (CSEM), enticing children to “self-produce” new CSEM, and grooming children for later contact abuse. It is operated through individual, family-run, cybersex “dens”, and cybersex centers operations (Ramiro et al., 2019; Varella, 2017; Terre des Hommes, 2013a). In individual operations, the victims voluntarily initiate the contact with the offender without the involvement of an operator or facilitator; in family-run operations, the parents or relatives, typically the mothers, subject their children to this form of abuse by coercing and guiding the child to perform sexual activities on camera; cybersex “dens” are large-scale operations hidden in houses mostly in slum areas composed of trafficked or recruited children; and lastly, cybersex operations disguised as business establishments operate mainly for sextortion and selling of CSEM, compared to cybersex dens these do not involve actual children (Ramiro et al., 2019).

Studies show that online sexual exploitation of children is generally a “family-based crime” (IJM, 2020, p. 51) wherein the victim’s own biological parents or relatives are the facilitators or operators of the abuse (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2020; Terre des Hommes, 2013a). Other people that the victims know or trust such as close friends of the family, neighbors, or other members of the community are also involved (Terre des Hommes, 2013a). While parents who are not directly involved in the crime tend to ignore and tolerate their children’s engagement in this form of exploitation since the child was able to help sustain the needs of family (Cruz & Sajo, 2015; Ramiro et al., 2019). Customers were found to be male foreigners from Western countries and their age ranges from 40 to 59 years old (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2020; UNODC, 2015; Ramiro et al., 2019).

Victims of online sexual exploitation were mostly young children, and a significant proportion of male victims and sibling groups were also involved (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2017, 2018, 2020; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016). The victims were from extremely poor, large, and some were from broken families (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; Ramiro et al., 2019; Terre des Hommes, 2013; UNICEF, 2016). Poverty due to limited income opportunities and lack of education and work skills is the key enabling factor of online child sexual exploitation (Cruz & Sajo, 2015; Garcia & Manikan, 2014; Hernandez et al., 2018; Ramiro et al., 2019; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; UNICEF, 2016; UNODC, 2015; Varella, 2017). Traffickers’ and victims’ involvement in this crime is rooted in “financial motivation” (IJM, 2020, p.56), and they perceive this form of abuse as an easy way to earn money and survive from poverty (Cruz & Sajo; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019). Despite knowing that this is a
crime and losing respect from the community, some families continuously engage in and justify subjecting their children to this form of exploitation because of its economic benefits (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; Ramiro et al., 2019; Varella, 2017).

Aside from the economic condition, another main driver that perpetuates livestreamed child sexual exploitation in the Philippines is the populations' proficiency in English language, which makes communication and transaction with Western customers easy (Hernandez et al., 2018; IJM, 2020; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016; Varella, 2017). Other main drivers include the affordability of phones or laptops and accessibility to internet, the presence of Piso Nets and Internet Cafes as alternatives if personal equipment is not available, and existence of well-established money transfer systems (Hernandez et al., 2018; UNICEF, 2016; Varella, 2017).

Online child sexual exploitation perpetuates in the family due to the parents' distorted belief that it is acceptable and harmless since there is no physical touch and sexual intercourse involved (Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; Terre des Hommes, 2013; Varella, 2017). Moreover, in view of the Filipino family values of utang na loob, some parents appeal to the child's sense of obligation to help provide for the family in order to persuade, manipulate, and subject them to engage in such abuse (Hernandez et al., 2018; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; UNICEF, 2016).

In the community level, online child sexual abuse is accepted and facilitated within the community due to its members' lack of awareness and knowledge of this crime, perception that it is harmless, and belief that it is an easy way to earn money (Ramiro et al., 2019; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Varella, 2017). The more people in the community become involved in this form of abuse, the more it becomes acceptable and normalized among its members (Ramiro et al., 2019). Acceptance and tolerance of online sexual abuse in the community is reflected in the refusal and lack of reporting of the incidence to the authorities despite the members' high level of awareness that this activity takes place in the neighborhood (Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016). This culture of silence and tolerance stems from the Filipino values of being non-confrontational, having a mind-your-own-business attitude to avoid being labelled as pakialamer, and pakikisama and pakikipagkapwa as they do not want to cause conflict with their neighbors (Ramiro et al., 2019).

These factors show that aside from lack of awareness and knowledge, the values, belief system, and attitude towards online sexual exploitation of the parents and community should be targeted for interventions and advocacy campaigns in order to respond to its continuous proliferation (Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019).

Online sexual abuse has damaging psychological effects to the child, and the victims are at
high-risk for re-victimization. When parents are the facilitators of the crime, the survivors may feel guilty to accuse and testify against their parents, so they lie, deny, and refuse to speak on the accusations to protect them (Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Varella, 2017). Victims also have a distorted belief that performing sexual acts in front of the camera is acceptable, not shameful, and harmless (Terre des Hommes, 2013b). They focus on the economic benefits of their acts to desensitize their negative feelings (Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Terre des Hommes, 2013b). Additionally, survivors' knowledge that the material exists and may be permanently visible to anyone online causes psychological distress such as shame, disgust, humiliation, powerlessness, and sense of worthlessness (Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Terre des Hommes, 2013b). The abuse is “ongoing with no definable end” (Martin, 2015, p. 270) because of the widespread distribution and permanent nature of these materials (Leonard, 2010; Martin, 2014; Martin, 2015), and at each subsequent viewing of it the survivor is re-victimized again (UNODC, 2015; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Terre des Hommes, 2013b).

In response to the continuous proliferation of this crime, awareness campaigns and programs were conducted in hotspot areas such as Cebu (TIP Report, 2016). SaferKidsPH campaign by the Australian government was established in partnership with UNICEF, Save the Children Philippines, and The Asia Foundation to raise awareness on online sexual exploitation of children. The CyberSafePH awareness campaign was created and launched by the Department of Information and Communications Technology (DICT) in cooperation with different NGOs. Moreover, the Department of Education (DepEd) trained 600 teachers from 11 regions to conduct cyber safety education (TIP Report, 2020). More importantly, the Philippine Internet Crimes Against Children Center (PICACC) was launched in 2019 which is a collaboration among local and international law enforcement and co-founded with IJM to combat and improve effectiveness of investigations of this crime (TIP Report, 2020).

**Alternative Care Options for Children Survivors of Online Sexual Exploitation**

The overall prevention and response to the abuse, neglect, and exploitation of children in the Philippines, including cases of online sex offending, is under the jurisdiction of the DSWD (Republic of the Philippines, 1991). The DSWD acts as the national lead agency in coordinating the formulation, implementation, and enforcement of all policies, programs, and projects for the survival, development, protection, and participation of children (Republic of the Philippines, 1991). The current system of case management of the DSWD is stipulated in the *Philippine Protocol for Case Management of Child Victims of Abuse, Neglect, and*
Exploitation developed by the Committee for the Special Protection of Children (2011), which is grounded in the principles of holistic care and rights-based approach in working with child survivors (Committee for the Special Protection of Children, 2011).

The UN CRC (UN Human Rights, 1990) and the Guidelines for the Alternative Care for Children (UN, 2010) set forth the global framework for providing appropriate care and protection for child victims of abuse and exploitation who are deprived of parental care or are at risk being so. They promote making every effort to keep the child in the care of the family and seeking the best Alternative Care option if the family is unable to provide a suitable natural environment for the growth, well-being, and protection of the child (UN, 2010).

In online sexual exploitation cases wherein the parents or other family members perpetrate the offense, alternative care options that can be considered are: (1) kinship care: family-based care within the child's extended family or close family friends familiar to the child (2) foster care: an authority places a child into the care of a qualified and approved caregiver, other than the child's own family; and (3) residential care: care provided in non-family-based group settings including all short/long-term residential care facilities and group homes (UN, 2010). For survivors of online sexual abuse who are mostly very young children and sibling groups, the UN CRC Guidelines states that alternative care for young children, especially those under the age of 3 years, should be provided in family-based settings, and siblings should not be separated by placements unless there is a clear risk of abuse or other justification in the best interests of the child (UN, 2010). In the Philippines, family-based care settings include kinship care, foster care, and adoption as a permanent option.

Kinship care is the most viable model of care in the Philippines as it is deeply rooted in the local culture (Save the Children, 2007) and heavily contextualized within the Filipino family value of kinship, by which the family and relatives serve as the safety net for all family members. Family plays an important role in long-term care, child-welfare, and economic support (Escoton, 2016). Caregivers can include family relatives, godparents, stepparents, or any adult who has a relation to a child (Save the Children, 2007). Kinship care can preserve family and community connections; reinforce the child's sense of identity through a knowledge of their family history and culture; avoid distress from moving in with strangers; decrease the possibility of multiple placements; and avoid institutionalization associated risks (Save the Children, 2007).

The international legal framework for alternative family care is the UN's Declaration on Social and Legal Principles Relating to the Welfare of Children with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally (1986) and Article 20 of the CRC (UN Human Rights, 1990). The latter asserts that the State holds the responsibility to provide special protection and assistance and to ensure alternative care for a child deprived
of family environment. At the national level, the Presidential Decree No. 603 (Philippines Congress, 1974) sets forth concrete measures for providing care for children in the context of the cultural belief that the family is the best environment for children to grow. For this reason, Article 68 of the decree advocates for preferential placement of a child in a foster home rather than in an institution (Philippines Congress, 1974).

Foster Care (Formal) is an arrangement in which temporary substitute parental care is provided for a child by a licensed foster family when the biological parents cannot care for the child, or while waiting for the child to be returned to birth parents or go through the adoption process. Republic Act 10165 or the Foster Care Act of 2012 (Republic of the Philippines, 2012), and MC 21 Series of 2018 or the DSWD Omnibus Guidelines on Foster Care Service provide detailed guidelines and procedures from the recruitment and development of foster parents, assessments (i.e., child study report and home study report), matching, provision of different supports and services for the child and foster family, and supervision of foster placement. Long-Term Foster Placement is allowed if the child has been under the care of a foster parent for a period of at least seven years. Adoption of the foster child is also allowed subject to the conditions stipulated under the RA 10165 and DSWD MC 21 Series of 2018.

There are agencies implementing foster care models that can be tapped for children survivors of online sexual abuse. Some of these agencies are: The Kaisahang Buhay Foundation (KGF), which provides temporary substitute family care for children-newborn to two years old; the NORFIL Foundation provides care for children under the age of 4 and takes into the consideration of the foster family’s preference of the age, sex and health condition of the child; Christian Growth Ministries Inc., which offers temporary substitute parental care through Foster Parents licensed by DSWD for children aged 0-2 years old who have been abandoned, neglected, or orphaned; and the Parenting Foundation of the Philippines, Inc.

Adoption, based on the Republic Act No. 8552 or the Domestic Adoption Act of 1998 (Republic of the Philippines, 1998), is the provision of a permanent family to a child whose parents have voluntarily or involuntarily relinquished parental authority over him or her. The child should be declared “legally available for adoption” and under the custody of the DSWD or a licensed and accredited child-placing or child-caring agency (Republic of the Philippines, 1998, p.1).

The unique and distinct nature of online sexual exploitation of children victimization pose challenges in providing aftercare services to survivors, especially care and support for very young children. If the family members were directly involved in the crime, kinship care may not be a viable option since the environment could be unsafe for the child (IJM, 2020), thus limiting the number of other available placement options to foster care (nonrelatives) and residential care. Moreover, if the parents are arrested, additional children aside from the
survivor who were not abused must also be placed in new homes (IJM, 2020). Additionally, given the demographics of survivors, most residential care centers were not designed for very young children and cannot accommodate mixed-gender sibling groups (IJM, 2017, 2018, 2020). While in terms of foster care, the current foster care system has limited capability to manage children survivors of online sexual exploitation (IJM, 2018). There are challenges looking for foster families who are willing to care for a sibling group and there is a high chance of separation when a sibling group is placed in foster homes. To address the challenges mentioned above, there is a need to strengthen family-based alternative care settings, strengthen the current foster care system, and expand placement options for very young children, boys, and sibling groups whilst permanent care solutions are being sought or while waiting for reintegration (IJM, 2018, 2020).

Reintegration Programs and Services for Survivors of Online Sexual Exploitation of Children in the Philippines

Based on the Interagency group’s guideline on children’s reintegration, reintegration is defined as “the process of separated child making what is anticipated to be a permanent transition back to his or her immediate or extended family and community, in order to receive protection and care and to find a sense of belonging and purpose in all spheres of life.” (Wedge, Krumholz, & Jones, 2013, p. 11). This report acknowledges that returning to their family may not be safe or a viable option for all children survivors of online sexual exploitation since a high percentage of family and relatives are directly involved in the crime (IJM, 2020). Hence, this study will adopt a broader definition of reintegration which is “the process of moving from an environment or situation of exploitation to one where the child has the same opportunities as other children in the community” (Cody, 2017, p. 22). In this definition, reintegration may involve returning to the child’s immediate or extended non-offending family and community or integration with an adoptive family and/or in a new community (Rafferty, 2019; Surtees, 2013).

The Department of Justice (DOJ) Protocol for Case Management of Child Victims of Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation articulates the multi-sectoral approach in providing appropriate protection and legal and social services for child victim-survivors in the country that involves national or local government agencies, nongovernment organizations, faith-based organizations, civic organizations, private sectors, police, prosecutors, judges, lawyers, social workers, medical doctors, psychiatrists, psychologists, and barangay officials in (Committee for the Special Protection of Children, 2011). This multi-disciplinary team aims to develop and discuss the recovery and reintegration plan, which includes fully assessing the parenting capability of parents and guardians or deciding upon a protective custody arrangement in a
childcaring agency or facility. This team also provides counseling, therapeutic activities, life skills education, vocational training, and is also responsible for supplying enough information for children nearing 18 years old desiring to live independently. Furthermore, they deliver interventions to the family, such as parent education, self-employment assistance, vocational or skills training, educational assistance, family counseling, or therapy (Committee for the Special Protection of Children, 2011). Additionally, this team continuously monitor the child’s progress once the survivor is reintegrated to the family and community.

**The Recovery and Reintegration Program for Trafficked Persons (RRPTP)**

The Recovery and Reintegration Program for Trafficked Persons (RRPTP) (Social Technology Bureau DSWD, 2015) implemented by the DSWD defined *reintegration and aftercare services* as the provision of interventions, approaches, and strategies to promote the effective restoration of social functioning and to prevent relapse in victim-survivors of trafficking. This program provides support services for the survivors to ensure their successful reintegration with their families and communities. It aims to enhance the awareness, skills, and capabilities of the individual, their families, and communities where the trafficked persons will be reintegrated (DSWD, 2015).

Services under this reintegration program are provided at the level of the individual, the family, and the community. The *individual survivor* is provided with counseling, educational assistance, vocational skills training, livelihood, and supports to reinforce the gains made during recovery and healing. For the *family*, therapy, livelihood, and new family environment services are facilitated. Within the community, education, advocacy, institutionalization of a system of surveillance, and multi-sectoral collaboration and coordination are also conducted (DSWD, 2015).

The reintegration process involves coordination between the *host region*, where the child survivor is placed, and the *receiving region*, where the family of the child survivor resides. The reunification social worker escorts the victim to the receiving region to attend a case conference with the family, at which they will plan for the continuous provision of aftercare services to the victim-survivor and his/her family by the Local Government Unit (LGU) social worker. The receiving region has the responsibility to monitor the provision of aftercare services, and it reports to the host region to update the referring organization on the case.

Based on the guidelines stipulated under RRPTP, the following services are provided to the reintegrated survivors of trafficking: (1) Medical Assistance, which may also be utilized for psychological services, where the survivor may avail medical services amounting to a maximum of P10,000; (2) Educational Assistance, which includes expenses for tuition, school
supplies, and other school-related expenses, P5,000 is allotted for primary and secondary education and P10,000 for tertiary education; and (3) Economic Reintegration Services that can be availed either by the survivor or their family. This assistance includes *skills training* wherein Php 7,000 will be allocated and released directly to TESDA/CHED accredited training school, plus P150 a day for 45 days in the duration of their training to support their daily needs; *financial assistance for employment* wherein P5,000 is allotted for job seeking expenses plus P150 a day for 45 days to subsidize their daily needs; and lastly, *financial assistance for livelihood* wherein they will be given an amount not exceeding to P10,000 for their business.

**The IJM Aftercare Model**

The Justice System Transformation (JST) model of practice that IJM implements for both Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) and online sexual exploitation of children strengthens the aftercare response from government and private aftercare providers. In collaboration with the DSWD and NGO partners, IJM Aftercare provides comprehensive and trauma-informed aftercare services, including collaborative case management, post-trauma counselling/psycho-social therapy, educational assistance, economic empowerment, and legal assistance to the survivors and their family with the aim to attain restoration and successfully reintegrate to their home communities (IJM, 2012). Further, IJM work closely with LGUs to ensure that reintegrated survivors and their family have access to community-based services (IJM, 2020). Support services for the community were also provided such as raising awareness on child protection laws and educating the communities about online sexual exploitation (IJM, 2020).

An evaluation of the IJM program to combat sex trafficking in the Philippines found that IJM's programs and support services have made big contributions on the rehabilitation, recovery, and access to community-based services for reintegration which resulted in survivors being better prepared to live in freedom and less vulnerable to being re-trafficked or re-victimized (IJM, 2017).

*Reintegration Support Network (RSN)* is part of the IJM’s model that offers a local support network of professionals and volunteers to reintegrated trafficked survivors and access to services which includes counselling, vocational and skills training, medical services, and educational assistance, with the aim to sustain the survivors’ reintegration (IJM, 2013, 2017). RSN acknowledge the importance of support group for the survivors’ restoration and in reducing the risk of re-victimization. It is operationalized in collaboration with local social workers and LGUs, particularly in case management services for the survivors and in addressing the gaps that arise in the local services available to the survivors (IJM, 2013).
The unique nature and demographics of victims and perpetrators of online sexual exploitation which include the very young children victimized (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2017, 2018, 2020; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016), the overwhelming number of families directly involved in the crime (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2020; Terre des Hommes, 2013a), the acceptance and tolerance of this form of abuse in communities involved (Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; Terre des Hommes, 2013; Varella, 2017), as well as the high risk for potential re-victimization of victims (UNODC, 2015; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Terre des Hommes, 2013b) present challenges in the sustained restoration and successful reintegration of survivors (IJM, 2020).

Reintegration Support Services for Survivors of Sexual Abuse in the Philippines

There is a limited number of studies that explored the recovery and reintegration of children survivors of sexual exploitation in the Philippines (Cody, 2017). Studies on reintegration in the local context have focused on the economic empowerment and sustainability of reintegrated trafficking survivors. Studies determined that when survivors return to their family and community, they face the same socioeconomic factors that initially made them vulnerable to trafficking, these include poverty, lack of sustainable employment, and debt (Camp, Barner, & Okech, 2018; Gill & Tsai, 2018; Lisborg, 2009; Tsai, Seballos-Llena, & Castellano-Datta, 2017; Tsai, 2017b, 2019). These ‘risk factors’ or ‘structural vulnerabilities’ may hinder the survivors’ successful reintegration as they remain highly vulnerable to abuse and re-victimization (Gill & Tsai, 2018; Rafferty, 2019; Tsai, 2017a, 2019; Williams et al., 2010). These risk factors should be directly addressed through economic empowerment (Camp et al., 2018). Financial stability was found to have a strong link with successful reintegration as well as on the psychological well-being and family stability of the survivors (Tsai et al., 2017).

Upon reintegration, survivors are also pressured to support their families’ financial needs (Tsai, 2017b, 2019; Tsai et al., 2017), which is stemmed on the Filipino concept of filial piety or utang na loob wherein children are obliged to provide for their family (Rafferty, 2019; Tsai, 2017a, 2017b). This shows that the family plays a vital role in the successful reintegration of the survivor (Camp et al., 2018; Tsai et al., 2017). Therefore, in designing reintegration support interventions there is a need to consider the financial responsibility, family dynamics, and household structure of the survivors (Tsai, 2017a, 2017b, 2019; Tsai et al., 2017).

While for reintegrated child survivors, support services for the parents are also crucial to ensure the successful reintegration of the child. Supports may include psychoeducation to help them build their parenting skills, educating them about the importance of parental
monitoring and supervision, awareness-raising on the impact of sexual exploitation, and family counselling (Asquith & Turner, 2018; Cody, 2017; Rafferty 2019).

The IJM Cebu Project Lantern (2007 to 2010) provided an understanding of what happens to survivors of trafficking through time (Asis, 2016; IJM, n.d.; IJM, 2010). Through the two-year monitoring of 94 reintegrated survivors, the study found that majority (58) had not been re-trafficked, 15 were re-trafficked, and the remaining 21 had not been confirmed. Project Lantern also developed the Economic Self-Sufficiency and Project to increase the sustainable job opportunities for trafficking survivors. Through this project, IJM assessed the existing community services related to economic self-sufficiency and reintegration, identified target industries that would provide employment to trafficking survivors, funded job skills training, partnered with businesses for job placement, and developed a Job Readiness Training Course.

Multiple studies determined gaps and barriers in the effective delivery of comprehensive services for reintegrated survivors. Assessment, comprehensive case management, and regular monitoring are crucial for the successful reintegration of survivors (Asquith & Turner, 2008; Cody, 2017; Muraya & Fry, 2015; Rafferty, 2019). Assessment determines the needs and readiness of the individual, family, and community (Cody, 2017). It also informs the formulation of comprehensive plan, interventions, and services to meet the unique needs of the survivors and their family (Cody, 2017; Rafferty, 2019). Poor assessment and case management may lead to a higher risk of re-victimization of victims (Muraya & Fry, 2015). Studies found that some service providers lack knowledge, skills, and training to conduct proper assessment and case management (IJM, 2017), provide support services, and respond to the mental health needs of the survivors (Cody, 2017; Williams et al., 2010).

Other challenges include lack of funding for reintegration programs and services (Cody, 2017; IJM, 2017; Williams et al., 2010) and lack of preparation of the communities to accept and support the survivor, which may result into the survivor being re-trafficked or re-victimized (IJM, 2010). A study by IJM (2017) found that there is no guarantee that community-based support services will be continuously provided to the individuals after reintegration. The same study also identified other limitations such as the lack of livelihood or income generating opportunities in communities and inadequate funds provided for livelihood assistance to respond to the needs of the survivor and their family (IJM, 2017). Additionally, there are some survivors who do not avail the assistance because they were not informed or aware of these services (Asis, 2016).

While in terms of livelihood and skills training programs, studies show that many training programs do not translate to sustainable employment opportunities and are unlikely to provide viable work and financial independence to the survivors (Lisborg, 2009; Tsai, 2017a, 2019).
This calls for the need to expand the current livelihood programs (Asis, 2016; IJM, 2010) and provide support that caters the specific needs, concerns, and strengths of survivors (Lisborg, 2009).

Currently, there is no study in the Philippines that explores the factors and necessary support services for the successful reintegration of children survivors of online sexual exploitation. This research aims to determine the interventions and support services needed at multiple levels of social environment; individual, family, and community to ensure the sustained restoration and successful reintegration of survivors.
Conceptual Framework

The Ecological Systems Theory was used as a framework for analysis of this study. This theory offers a holistic perspective for understanding the relationship and interaction among the individual, family, community, and cultural environments, and how each shape and influence one another (Barner, Okech, Camp, 2017; Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Sanchez & Pacquiao, 2018; Teater, 2014). The theory asserts that the child’s development occurs within the four types of environmental contexts or levels of systems namely, microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Ecological systems theory has been applied in the context of child maltreatment to determine the interaction of the individual characteristics of children, family characteristics (microsystem), community (exosystem), and cultural values or society (macrosystem) that determined risks for maltreatment (Belsky, 1980). This theory has also been applied in wide range of studies related to trafficking and child sexual abuse. Studies that utilized this perspective include research on risk factors that facilitate sex trafficking (Sanchez & Pacquiao, 2018), support services and interventions for survivors of trafficking (Barner, et al., 2017; Sanchez & Pacquiao, 2018), trauma and resilience of survivors (Cecchet & Thoburn, 2014), and sexual re-victimization (Pittenger, Huilt, & Hansen, 2016).

Using this lens, this study examined the environmental context – individual, family, community, and societal level – of the survivors to: (1) provide a comprehensive understanding of the risk factors that facilitate online sexual exploitation in children, families, and communities impacted by this form of abuse, and determine gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services for survivors; (2) determine the factors that
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Contribute to successful reintegration of survivors including the interventions and support services that need to be provided at each level of system. This research will not address the meso and chrono systems, the focus is narrowed to the individual, family (microsystem), community/neighborhood (exosystem), and societal level (macrosystem).

Studies that employed ecological systems theory conceptualized the individual level as the demographic characteristics and experiences that makes an individual vulnerable to victimization (Belsky, 1980; Pittenger et al., 2016; Sanchez & Pacquiao, 2018). This report determined the individual characteristics of the children survivors of online sexual exploitation that made them susceptible to this form of abuse as well as interventions or support services that should be provided for their successful reintegration. The microsystem which is the inner-most layer of an individual’s ecology represents the immediate environment or close relationships of the individual which includes family, peer groups, and school (Belsky, 1980; Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Pittenger et al., 2016). This study focused on the family system to determine the characteristics and risk factors of families involved in this form of abuse as well as interventions and services that should be provided at this level to support the survivors’ successful reintegration.

While exosystem represents a larger social system that has an indirect influence on the individual which includes the community/neighborhood or workplace (Belsky, 1980; Bronfenbrenner, 1994). This report assessed the risk factors of the communities where online sexual abuse proliferates and interventions needed at this level to support reintegration of survivors and prevent/respond to this form of abuse.

---

**Figure 1. Conceptual Framework**
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This report examined the environmental context – individual, family, community, and societal level – of the survivors to provide a comprehensive understanding of the risk factors that facilitate online sexual exploitation in children, families, and communities impacted by this form of abuse. Gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services for survivors, which are also potential risk factors for re-victimization of survivors were also identified. This study also determined the factors that contribute to successful reintegration of survivors including the interventions and support services that need to be provided at each level of system. Lastly, there is also a brief discussion about alternative care options for those who cannot be reintegrated to their family and community. However, there is no in-depth discussion on the interventions and supports that should be provided to survivors placed in different alternative care settings.

Research Sample

The participants of this study are composed of non-offending family members, community members/neighbors, and service providers. In order to select these respondents, 18 children were randomly nominated from the list of IJM online sexual exploitation of children clients (2018) using the following criteria:

Geographical location of survivors: From each of the total number of clients per selected regions, survivors were randomly selected as shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Random Selection of Children Survivors of Online Sexual Exploitation per Geographical Location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total No. of Clients</th>
<th>No. of Selected Survivors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Manila</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region IV</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region VII</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region XIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship to other survivors at time of rescue: At least one participant rescued as an individual. At least one participant rescued as member of a sibling group. At least one participant rescued with neighbors. At least one participant rescued with cousins or relatives.

Relationship to perpetrator of the crime: At least three participants with non-offending parents, family members, and relatives.

The non-offending family members and neighbors of the 18 nominated children survivors of online sexual exploitation were selected as respondents. While service provider participants include IJM caseworkers who handled case management of selected children, and service providers in the shelter and in the community that have knowledge of and involvement with the chosen survivors. The service providers (DSWD, LGU, and NGO) have a working knowledge of reintegration and the direct implementation of programs and services relevant to adoption, foster care, family reunification, independent living, and community support services. Five focus group discussions among service providers were conducted on four regions with the highest number of IJM online sexual exploitation of children clients (NCR, Region III, Region IV-A, and Region VII).

Data Gathering Methods

This study employed a qualitative approach. Key informant questionnaires were distributed to 55 respondents and five focus group discussions with a total of 40 participants were conducted among service providers. The survey respondents were composed of 19 non-offending family members and 18 neighbors of the selected survivors as well as 18 service providers (private and government service providers). Five focus group discussions among service providers from NCR, Region IV-A, Region III, and Bacolod which represents the regions that have the highest number of IJM online sexual exploitation of children clients were conducted. The data gathering was done from February 2018 to August 2018.

Key informant questionnaires were developed for each group of participants; family of the survivors, neighbors or community members, service providers survey respondents (DSWD, LGU, and NGOs), and service providers FGD participants (DSWD, LGU, and NGOs). The Key Informant Questionnaires and Focus Group Discussion Questions were composed of open-ended questions on the respondents' knowledge about online sexual exploitation of children, individual, family, and community level risk factors that facilitate online sexual abuse, support services needed for the reintegration of survivors, alternative programs for survivors who cannot be reintegrated to their family and community, and preventive measures to prevent and respond to online sexual exploitation of children problems in the Philippines. Questions were in Tagalog, Visayan, and English [See Appendix A]. The key informant questionnaires
were distributed via mail (to community service providers only) or in person to respondents that were unable to participate in the focus group discussions.

Data gathered from the responses in the key informant questionnaires (non-offending family members, community members, and service providers) and focus group discussions among service providers were analyzed using textual and thematic analysis in order to establish themes in line with the research objectives of the study. The multistep procedure of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clark (2006) was employed which includes familiarization with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, and defining and naming themes. Some parts of the audio-recordings of the focus group discussions were transcribed. Audio recordings were also revisited and reviewed for clarifications. The transcripts and responses from the informant questionnaires (survey) were analyzed line-by-line to determine recurring concepts and generate initial codes or categories. These codes/categories were then clustered into themes. The themes were reviewed multiple times to determine whether there are relationships or connections between the themes. Findings included direct quotes to illustrate each theme and present the experiences of the participants.

**Ethical Considerations and Limitations of the Study**

Research consent from the DSWD Standards Bureau was acquired in order to conduct the study. Signed informed consent was obtained from all participants prior the interview and focus group discussions. The informed consent contains details on the research topic, purpose of the study, potential risks and benefits, data gathering procedure, and anonymity and confidentiality [See Appendix B]. Participation to this research was voluntary. Maintaining the anonymity and confidentiality of participants was also a major consideration. Critical information that the researcher deemed likely to endanger the organization involved and the management of cases is omitted in the full presentation and report of this study. Use of pseudonyms and disclosure of detailed information are likewise ensured. Since this study employed a qualitative approach and the sample included is not a representative sample, the participants' narratives and the themes identified in the findings cannot be generalized to all OSEC survivors and their families and communities.
Results and Discussion

Demographics of the Participants

Focus Group Discussions Service Providers

Five focus group discussions were completed with a total of 40 participants. Four (4) participants were male and thirty-six (36) were female. Thirteen (13) were from the DSWD, five (5) were from LGUs, and twenty-two (22) were from NGOs. Twenty-seven (27) identified their role as social workers, eight (8) as management, two (2) as psychologists, two (2) as from planning units, and one (1) as a researcher. Fifteen (15) of the participants did not disclose the number of years they have been practicing in the social services field, of the twenty-five (25) who disclosed, the range of years of service is one to forty. Experience in online sexual exploitation of children of the twenty-one (21) participants who disclosed ranged from no experience to five years with an average of 1.7 years. Four focus group discussions were conducted in Luzon while one was in the Visayas.

Survey Respondents Service Providers

Eighteen (18) individual surveys were completed by key informants working with children survivors of online sexual exploitation. One (1) participant was male and seventeen (17) were female. Nine (9) were from LGUs, and nine (9) were from non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Thirteen (13) identified their role as a social worker, three (3) as management, and two (2) did not disclose their primary role. Thirteen (13) of the participants did not disclose the number of years they have been practicing in the social services field, and there was a range of one to thirty years of service for those five (5) participants who did disclose.
Experience in OSEC for the ten (10) participants who disclosed ranged from one to three years with an average of 2.4 years. Two (2) were from Luzon and sixteen (16) were from the Visayas.

**Community Members**

Eighteen (18) individual key informant questionnaires were completed with neighbors or barangay officials from the same barangay as the case study participants. The average age of the thirteen (13) participants who disclosed their age was 48.85, with a range from 25-62. There were five (5) male and thirteen (13) female participants. Ten (10) were from Luzon and eight (8) were from the Visayas.

**Family Members**

Nineteen (19) individual key informant questionnaires were completed with family members of case study participants. The average age of the fourteen (14) respondents who disclosed their age was 41.14, with a range from 16-65. There were eight (8) male and eleven (11) female respondents. Eleven (11) were from Luzon and eight (8) were from the Visayas. Nine (9) participants did not include their relationship to the survivors. Seven (7) participants were parents, two (2) were aunts, and one (1) was a foster parent of the case study participant.

**Risk Factors that Facilitate Online Sexual Exploitation of Children**

This section discusses the individual, family, community, and societal level risk factors that facilitate online sexual exploitation of children. Results identified the following common themes: easy money perception of livestreamed child sexual exploitation and poverty, lack of knowledge and awareness about online sexual exploitation, access to internet and technology and proficiency in English language, neglect of parental role and responsibilities of primary caregiver, and survivor's perception of victimization. Further, service providers identified the current gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services for survivors. These gaps are also potential “risk factors” that may cause reintegrated survivors susceptible to re-victimization. The following gaps were determined: lack of comprehensive assessment, lack of community-based intervention, lack of community-based monitoring post-reintegration, and lack of capacity of local government to intervene. Discussion about “family” and “community” in this report pertains to those who are engaged in and impacted by this form of abuse and not intended to describe the families and communities in general.

**Easy money perception of livestreamed child sexual exploitation and poverty**

Most of the participants identified poverty and the belief that it is an easy way to earn money as key risk factors for engaging in this form of abuse. Some participants mentioned that the
lack of stable income and financial resources made the facilitators and victims susceptible to this form of exploitation. A participant narrated:

“Poverty is really a major reason for this crime... There were times that they would go to the town to claim the money from the foreigner. It would amount to 5,000 pesos. The mother got blinded and eventually, did it again and again. They really don’t know what’s happening around and because of poverty, the parents would do anything.” (SP22, a service provider from Region III)

Informants said that families use poverty and the need to survive as an excuse for subjecting their children to livestreamed sexual abuse, a service provider from Region IV-A said:

“It’s an income-generated activity or livelihood. They justify it because they don’t have no other source of income.” (SP2, a service provider from Region IV-A)

Some informants emphasized that this form of abuse is widespread in the communities because it is a quick and easy way to earn money. Participants mentioned that not all people who engaged in online sexual abuse are poor as they also have well-off clients. They stressed that facilitators and victims, irrespective of economic status, are enticed to engage in this easy-money activity. Others also noted that some resort to this form of exploitation in order to support their “wants” not really their needs. In line with other studies, the root cause for online sexual exploitation involvement is its economic benefits or financial gain and facilitators are attracted to easy money (Cruz & Sajo, 2015; IJM, 2020; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019). Further, there are available resources that can be utilized to engage in this form of abuse, resources include access to cheap mobile phones/laptop and internet and the convenience of accepting payments through money transfers.

Although easy money and poverty are the main factors in the decision to resort to online sexual exploitation, a service provider emphasized the need to determine and evaluate other “push” factors aside from economic condition that facilitate this form of abuse in the family and community, she explained:

“I’m trying to look at the intervention that doesn’t focus on the economic factors. DSWD has been working with this for decades, but what changed? We should think of other factors affecting them and we focus on that thing aside from focusing on economic factor. If we really want to resolve this kind of issues, we shouldn’t focus on economic because it is so given.” (SP12, a service provider from NCR)

**Lack of awareness and knowledge about online sexual exploitation of children**

Majority of the participants emphasized that lack of knowledge and awareness about online sexual exploitation of children is a crucial determinant for its continuous proliferation in the
family and community. Service providers said that facilitators and victims were not aware that it is a crime punishable by law. Based on the responses of the non-offending family members, most of them asserted that they do not have any idea what online sexual exploitation is. While some participants determined the benefit of raising awareness that it is a criminal offense in families and communities as it may encourage members to report suspected cases to the authorities and engage in prevention efforts to combat this form of abuse. Participants narrated:

“Aside from being manipulated by the perpetrators or their relatives, I think their lack of information that such show is a form of abuse. If they know that they are being abused by doing the show, they might as well not do it or report it to DSWD or the police.” (SP6, a service provider from Region IV-A)

“If only the community and the family know the social impact of this problem, then maybe they become aware and later on, they can help us and also our partners to fight against this.” (SP18, a service provider from Region III)

Moreover, aside from lack of knowledge that it is an offense, they are also unaware of the detrimental effects that it can inflict on victims. The family and community have a distorted belief that livestreamed sexual exploitation is a non-abusive practice and has no harmful effects to the victims since there is no physical touch or sexual intercourse involved. Simply put, “they have this no touch, no harm mindset.” (SP10, a service provider from NCR). Informants said that many used the misperception that “it’s just a show”, “it’s just a picture”, and “they have nothing to lose” as an excuse to justify subjecting their children to this abuse. Participants narrated:

“Their concept is that it is not a bad thing because it’s just a “show,” no touching. For the parents and relatives, it’s not a big deal.” (SP1, a service provider from Region IV-A)

“The reason of the parents is that their children are not touched. It’s just a picture, but they don’t realize the naked picture of the children going far.” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

“My perception about it is that the perpetrators are not aware that their children are being victimized by this crime because they feel that they have nothing to lose and that their kids are not being touched.” (SP20, a service provider Region 3)

Due to the lack of knowledge and awareness, distorted belief that it is harmless, and perception that it is an easy way to earn money, online sexual exploitation of children became widely accepted and tolerated in the community (Ramiro et al., 2019; Terre des Hommes, 2013; Varella, 2017). This acceptance and tolerance anchored on the belief system are crucial
mechanisms that makes it contagious. As literature suggests, the more it is tolerated and socially accepted, the more it becomes a normalized activity within the community (Ramiro et al., 2019). An informant narrated:

“Many have been rescued from that community and were placed in our institution, the community sees it as common, acceptable, and non-abusive practice. It’s like the barangay or the neighborhood is known that they have that kind of activity.” (SP4 a service provider from Region IV-A)

Informants specified that tolerance is reflected in the community members’ lack or refusal of reporting and turning a blind eye on it despite high level of awareness that this crime takes place in the area. Some participants blamed it to the Filipino culture of not wanting to get involved in the matters of other people or having a “mind-your-own business attitude” to avoid being labelled as pakialamero or nangingialam (Ramiro et al., 2019). One informant narrated:

“Our culture that if your family is not directly involved or affected, you don’t care. Generally, even in domestic violence even if there’s a law, when a couple fights against each other usually even if [s/he] is badly beaten even the nearest neighbors would not meddle. Unlike in other countries, even just a commotion you will report it and dial the police and call 911 to get rescued. Here, you’re already dead, still they don’t care. Malasakit or concern is lacking.” (SP2, a service provider from Region IV-A)

Another participant from the same focus group discussion concurred and said:

“We tend to detach ourselves from the lives of our neighbors.” (SP4, a service provider from Region IV-A)

Access to internet and technology and proficiency in English Language

In all the focus group discussions, informants stated that the affordability and accessibility of internet and technology is one of the main driving mechanisms on the continuous increase of online sexual abuse cases. They said everyone has access to cheap phones that can be connected to the internet. In fact, Filipinos consider owning cellphones as a necessity and an utmost priority over other things. Service providers explained:

“Their access to gadgets and cellphones. In the Philippines, being one of the biggest markets of cellphones, a poor family can own more than the number of household members, compared to the number of equipment that they have. For them, it’s okay if they don’t have money for rent for as long as they have cellphones.” (SP6, a service provider from Region IV-A)
Along with this is the existence of cheap and disposable sim cards, which is ideal for the customers and traffickers since it can easily cover tracks. One service provider explained:

“There’s easy access for us even if we only have a cheap phone that can be connected to the Internet that can be used. Filipinos are one of the leading text countries in the world. Everyone has phones. Sometimes, even the poor earners have more advanced phones. In the Philippines, sim cards are disposable. It’s hard to track if you’re just using a sim card. After negotiating with one client, you can just throw away the sim card and buy/use another one. It’s very cheap.” (SP24, a service provider from Region III)

Moreover, absence of personal mobile phone or laptop is not a barrier in accessing the internet since there are Internet Cafes and Piso/Peso Nets everywhere (Hernandez et al., 2018; UNICEF, 2016; Varella, 2017). One service provider described how Peso Nets may be operated for livestreamed sexual abuse:

“Because peso net is in the home now. It's in the house of the owner. It looks like a private home. And there might be one room that is for a private show. A private room. There is that in Cebu. A back room which is secluded. That is in Cordova.” (A service provider from Bacolod)

Other participants pointed out that another risk factor is the unregulated nature of the internet that provides opportunities for this form of online abuse to occur. One participant shared:

“Regulatory aspect. Internet is very free, there is no regulation. Children can easily access it. It arouses the curiosity of the kids without any parental guidance. No restrictions.” (SP20, a service provider from Region III)

Access to internet and technology as a risk factor is fueled with the Filipinos proficiency in English language. Their ability to speak English well makes it possible and easy for them to communicate, transact, and negotiate with foreign, mostly Western, customers (Hernandez et al., 2018; IJM, 2020; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016; Varella, 2017). Since there is little to no language barriers, foreigners can easily dictate whatever they want to the traffickers and victims. Due to the facilitators’ and victims’ economic condition and motivation to earn easy money including lack of knowledge and awareness about online sexual exploitation of children, these available “resources”, affordability and accessibility of mobile phones/laptops and internet as well as the ability to communicate in English, were utilized to engage in this form of abuse.

**Neglect of parental role and responsibilities of primary caregiver**

Studies found that online sexual exploitation is a “family-based crime” since a high
percentage of the facilitators or operators of the abuse are the biological parents or close relatives of the victims (IJM, 2020; Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Garcia & Manikan, 2014). Due to the risk factors discussed above; financial needs, motivation to earn easy money, lack of knowledge and awareness, including access to available “resources” that can be utilized to engage in this form of exploitation, families neglect their parental roles and responsibilities by subjecting their children to this abuse. Service providers described families directly or indirectly involved in this exploitation as dysfunctional, neglectful, and those who lack knowledge on responsible parenthood, one participant noted:

“There seems to be a failure from the parents. Lack of knowledge in parenthood…Our education system does not highlight how to become better parents. I believe there are no problems with children, we only have dysfunctional parents. This results to issues like OSEC.” (SP20, a service provider from Region 3)

Some participants characterized livestreamed child sexual exploitation as “cycle” or “pattern” within the family and compared it into a “business” because someone, in some cases everyone, from the household was involved in this abuse (Cruz & Sajo, 2015). Service providers explained that parents who are facilitators or operators were also former victims. They said that in some instances, the mothers are the first one to perform “shows” but when the customer demands for children, they offer their own child. Participants narrated:

“It has been a business, from the grandmother down to the mother, uncles and aunts are all involved... The parents are also vulnerable to this kind of crime. If it’s the kind of world they live in, it becomes normal for them. Like I mentioned, it started from the grandparents to the parents.” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

“…it went into ‘cycle’ already, the mother also did that before. It’s mother first and then when the perpetrators ask for younger children, they offer their own daughters.” (SP10, a service provider from NCR)

Currently, there is no empirical evidence yet that strongly supports this hypothesis that traffickers were also former victims (IJM, 2020). Aside from this, the Filipino family values such as the concept of utang na loob and parental authority are extorted. Parents appeal to the child’s sense of responsibility and obligation to contribute to the needs of the family. Participants explained:

“Also, the culture that the children, especially the older ones, are expected to share financial support with the family, especially those who are teenagers already. They are effective in doing not only the household chores, but also in giving additional income, especially to low-income families.” (SP2, a service provider from Region IV-A)
“The child is willing and eager to help the family because she is witnessing how poor they are, it’s the only way that she can contribute to the family.” (SP17, a service provider from Region III)

Moreover, it is part of the Filipino culture to treat parents as the “authority,” hence children are compelled to follow whatever their parents instruct them to do. Service providers narrated:

“For families, wherein the parents are the perps, they tell their children, just obey me and there’s nothing wrong. You can buy and eat whatever you want. We’re just poor, right? So, there’s nothing wrong. You just need to talk to the person in the laptop.” (SP17, a service provider from Region IV-A)

“Let’s also identify their coping mechanisms, especially when they are dictated by their parents because they see them as the authority, so they have to follow. They cannot say what they feel about what they’re doing. Most of the time, it’s against their will. It’s because of the nurturing and grooming, they just enjoy.” (SP18, a service provider from Region IV-A)

Whereas parents who were not directly involved in the crime were characterized by the participants as neglectful and lack parenting skills as well as parental guidance for their child. Because these parents were busy making livelihood, they were not able to perform and fulfill their responsibilities to their child such as monitoring and supervision of their activities. In some cases, they may have unknowingly entrusted their children to their neighbors, friends, or relatives involved in the crime. Participants explained that even though these parents have a hint or see signs that their children are involved into something illegal, they just tend to ignore it. Parents turn a blind eye on it because they also gain economic benefit from the abuse (Ramiro et al., 2019). Service providers detailed:

“Most of the time, parents are out of the house, they have no time to monitor their kids. Kids have no escorts or someone older to watch over and take care of them. During the interview, we asked them and they said they don’t know, but they have hints. They are wondering why their children can afford to buy these things. Yet, parents don’t ask for more information. They just think their children are also working as scavengers, collecting bottles and old newspaper. Eventually, they won’t ask for more information from their kids anymore. So, during our parent effectiveness sessions, we advocate for them not to stay passive especially when the start to notice how their children afford some things despite their poverty. They need to ask where those things come from and how they can afford to buy them because they might not know that they are already indulging in this kind of crime without their knowledge.” (SP23, a service provider from Region III)

“They don’t know it’s happening to their child. Some parents are neglectful, but some
just don’t know that it’s happening to their child.” (A service provider from Bacolod)

**Survivor’s perception about victimization**

Similar with other studies, the participants determined that very young children are the most vulnerable to online sexual exploitation victimization (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2017, 2018, 2020; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016). Their young age, naivety, lack of confidence, and innocence makes them susceptible to this kind of abuse. Moreover, since children easily trust the people who are close to them, they can be easily fooled and manipulated to follow what they are told to do. These children are neglected, helpless, and have no capability to protect themselves. Service providers explained:

“Since children are trusting, they can easily be lured by the perpetrators especially if the perps are family or relatives. There are also cases that these are neglected children, so they long and seek for attention and care. And then of course, the perp would groom them first, encourage them, manipulate their vulnerability, and then they bribe them. They provide what the children want or need just to encourage them to do such things.” (SP4, a service provider from Region IV-A)

“She doesn’t have the power to fight back against the perpetrator, so she would just follow whatever the instructions given to her.” (SP24, a service provider from Region III)

Majority of the participants also stressed that another main risk factor and challenge in providing interventions to survivors is that they have no realization that they are victims. They have no idea that what happened was a form of abuse because they trusted the people who exploited them. The survivor’s perception about victimization is built upon the beliefs and attitudes of their family towards this crime. As discussed in the previous section, family values are extorted by manipulating and persuading the child to perform acts in front of the camera in order to help provide for the family. Instead of seeing themselves as victims and the act as a form of abuse, they perceive it as acceptable, harmless, and economically beneficial since they were able to contribute to the needs of their family (Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Terre des Hommes, 2013b). A service provider explained:

“They don’t have the knowledge, they don’t fully understand the situation they were in, unaware that they are already exploited and abused because they trusted those who exploit them. Before, all they understand is that there’s nothing wrong with doing it, thinking that they can help with the family’s needs.” (SP8, a service provider from NCR)

And when participants were asked about the resiliency of the survivors, some participants argued that it is not possible for them to develop resilience if in the first place they do not realize that they are victims, while another participant attributed this unawareness to being
resilient in a negative way by adapting to their situation. One participant said:

“How can they be resilient if they don’t know they are victims?” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

While another participant noted:

“They are resilient in a negative way, so they don’t realize that they are victims.” (SP14, a service provider from NCR)

Failure or refusal to acknowledge themselves as victims was identified by a lot of participants as one of the major challenges in designing and providing interventions for survivors because there are no signs or manifestations of trauma. Comparing with other forms of abuse, a participant explained:

“...the main thing is they don’t realize they are victims, that is the main problem of social work intervention, we cannot come up with a good intervention compared to the sexually, physically abused where there is trauma. Here, victims don’t realize, and they are not traumatized... This is difficult for social workers to come up with an intervention, this is a new phenomenon. Mental iyan, changing the mindset. And then unlike sexual abuse, physical, may trauma, you can address something. But this is something different.” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

In fact, the trauma for the children is not the crime itself, but their separation from their family, the same participant asserted:

“Because the young victims, they don’t even know why they were separated from their parents. Minors, 5 years old, why are we separated? That is their biggest trauma, but not the crime itself but the separation from the families. They don’t really understand why. That is the trauma of the children, the separation.” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

Service providers from NCR raised that there are different conceptualizations of victimization based on the age of the survivors. It was pointed out that the victimization for very young children (i.e., infants to five years old) is different from teenagers, a service provider explained that:

“We still need to define what the concept of victimization for victims is. OSEC is a broad case compared to trafficking. 1 to 2 years old victimization is different from 16 to 18 years old. Some nude photos are self-inclined. They would say no one is really selling them [pimping], they just do it or trade it on their own. So, how would our approach be for this kind of victims?” (SP4, a service provider from NCR)

While other social workers mentioned that they also face challenges when filing a case,
especially if the parents are the facilitators or perpetrators of the crime. In line with the findings of other studies, survivors may feel guilty to accuse their parents, so they lie or deny the accusation in order to protect them (Terre des Hommes, 2013a; Varella, 2017). A service provider from Region III explained:

**As far as filing of the case is concerned, it is not easy to motivate a victim to testify against the perp especially if the parents are involved. They feel guilty that their parents will be put to jail. They are worried about what their other relatives would think if they knew that they are the reason why their parents are imprisoned. That’s the challenge the child has to face. There should be proper motivation, enough time and information for the victim, like saying, she is your mother, she’s supposed to be the one to protect you.” (SP22, A service provider from Region III).**

**Risk factors and gaps in the LGU level**

Participants also identified the current gaps in the system that affect the effective delivery of interventions and support services to survivors. These gaps may become “risk factors” or predictors that makes reintegrated survivors susceptible to re-victimization.

**Lack of comprehensive assessment:** Assessment is a key factor for the successful reintegration of survivors as it determines the readiness of the individual to return to his/her family, and the capability of the family to sustain the needs of the child. It also identifies the type of services and areas of support that are needed to meet the unique needs of the survivor and their family (Cody, 2017; Rafferty, 2019). Some participants raised their concern about assessment not being properly implemented. Specifically, they mentioned that Parent Capability Assessment Report (PCAR) which is under the responsibility of LGU social workers were not being met. A participant explained:

“**Before we discharge the kids to their family, we request for parental capability assessment. LGU can be of big help. Unfortunately, they are handling big cases, they will just invite the family to the office, no intervention being made. It is the responsibility of the LGUs...The reason why kids stay longer in the shelter, we are not convinced of the assessment.”** (SP11, a service provider from NCR)

The same concern was also echoed by some service providers in Region IV-A, one of the participants shared:

“**Our difficulty as an NGO is the network with the LGU because we really need to keep pushing them to conduct parenting capability assessment and other requirements.”** (SP4, a service provider from Region IV-A)

Another service provider emphasized the need to coordinate, collaborate, and conduct
the assessments simultaneously while the casework of the child is ongoing, to ensure that the family is ready for the return of the child and the Aftercare is prepared to deliver services. She also pointed out that poor assessment and lack of preparation may result into the re-victimization of the child once returned to the home community. She explained:

“Upon admission to the shelter, there must be already an advanced information on the community level social worker, so that the Aftercare program will start right there and then, rather than waiting for the child to go out, then that’s only the start of the PCAR assessment. I’m speaking in general, whether it’s OSEC or another [form of] human trafficking, sometimes, the local community is not informed that there is a child placed in an institution who came from this barangay, and the Aftercare service is not fully prepared. Even if the child has already recovered, the child can come back to being re-victimized because there is no full knowledge from the Aftercare. While the casework with the child is ongoing, the community social worker should also simultaneously do the family assessment. Therefore, once the child is reintegrated, the family is ready to accept the child.” (SP23, a service provider from Region III).

A study by IJM (2017) also determined proper implementation of assessment and case management as a concern among LGU social workers. Similar with this study, participants attributed this problem to the limited number of LGU social workers who are also responsible for large caseloads, lack of government resources, and lack of capacity, knowledge, and skills of service providers to properly conduct the assessment. Weak assessment and poor case management may result into higher risk of re-victimization (Muraya & Fry, 2015). If assessments were not properly conducted, reintegrated survivors may be vulnerable again to the risk factors that initially made them susceptible to engage in this form of abuse.

Lack of community-based intervention: Several participants mentioned that there are several programs for reintegrated survivors; however, there is a lack prioritization as well as lack of funds and resources allocated to implement and sustain these programs and services. Participants narrated:

“Sometimes, the programs also depend on the priority of the chief executive. Even though they are nice programs, but if the executive doesn’t prioritize them, it’s very difficult to execute them... For these children not to go back to this kind of easy-money activity, we already have barangay-family sessions, job placement, sustainable livelihood program, a lot of trainings, but we lack funds... External programs. Scholarship funds. Still, it depends on the legislators. We have the policy and the guidelines for our clients and yet, it’s still beyond our control.” (SP18, a service provider from Region III)

Another participant shared the same concern, she said:
“We have been conducting parent effectiveness sessions (PES), more likely the same with family development sessions (FDS). The beneficiaries of FDS are required to attend the sessions, unlike in PES. If they don’t attend the FDS, they cannot receive the financial assistance. Also, strengthen the local council for the protection of children (LCPC) who are composed of judges, barangay captains, HODs. However, sustaining a program like this is really hard especially when there are a lot of laws and yet, we don’t have enough funds. There are a lot of laws thrown at us, like scholarships for children, but there are no appropriate funds being allocated to the LGU and inter-agencies concerned who are the ones directly implementing these laws.” (SP23, a service provider from Region III).

Without access to community-based services, especially economic and psychosocial support, reintegrated survivors are at high risk of re-victimization or may even become the facilitator or operator of the crime.

Lack of community-based monitoring post reintegration: Some participants mentioned that when the child is reintegrated to their family and community, continuous monitoring and follow up are not implemented and complying with requirements such as submission of progress reports were not met. A service provider from Region IV-A commented:

“We state in the letter what needs to be done (home visits, provide family development session, family therapy). Every six months, there must be progress reports. Unfortunately, usually what happens is that no report is given to us after 6 months unless we demand them to submit the report. It is not being imposed once the child returns home.” (SP16, a service provider from Region IV-A)

Other participants mentioned the need to conduct continuous consultation, coordination, and case conferences in order to determine how far the services have been done. However, the lack of manpower was cited as a challenge to do so. Regular monitoring is needed to determine the social functioning of the child in the family and community and to lessen the risk of re-victimization and becoming operators or facilitators of this crime.

Lack of capacity of local government to intervene: Some participants said that BCPC and LCPC exist, but they are not active or operational. Participants also raised concern that some of the barangay officials know who the OSEC perpetrators are in the community, however, they just turn a blind eye and do nothing about it. Further, they added that the local government is not trained and equipped to protect the children and handle victims, one service provider commented:

“We need to strengthen the Barangay Child Protection Council. We asked the barangay regarding the protection of the kids, they don’t know what to do, they are not equipped, they are not trained, or they don’t have knowledge of how they are going to protect the
victims.” (SP16, a service provider from NCR)

**Risk Factors Systemic Trends**

“We cannot detach the individual from the family, and we cannot detach the family from the community.” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

*Individual level:* At the individual level, children were found to be the most vulnerable to online sexual exploitation victimization (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2017, 2018, 2020; Kuhlmann & Auren, 2013; Ramiro et al., 2019; UNICEF, 2016). Characteristics of children that make them susceptible to this form of abuse include naivety, innocence, trusting, inability to protect themselves, easy to persuade and manipulate, they have no realization that they are victims, and they have no signs of trauma.

*Family level:* In the family level, parents engage in livestreamed child sexual exploitation due to financial needs, and they are attracted to earn easy money. Their lack of knowledge and awareness about this crime including their no touch, no harm mindset were also important predictors why they resort to this form of abuse. These parents were described by the participants as those who neglected their parental role and responsibilities, lack knowledge on responsible parenthood, are dysfunctional. For parents who were directly involved in the crime, some participants mentioned that it has become a cycle or pattern within the family since operators or facilitators were former victims. Further, the family extorts Filipino values such as *utang na loob* and parental authority to persuade and manipulate their child to perform such acts. Whereas for parents who were not directly involved in the abuse, they were described as neglectful and lack parental guidance and supervision. Even if they see signs that their children might be involved into something illegal, they just ignore it because they also gain something from it.

*Community level:* Acceptance and tolerance of this abuse in the community were attributed to the members’ lack of knowledge and awareness about online sexual exploitation, belief that it is a harmless and an easy way to earn money, and the lack of capacity of the barangay to intervene. Participants mentioned that this acceptance and tolerance anchored on the belief system of the community may result to normalization of this crime, which is a crucial mechanism that makes it contagious and widespread among its members. Further, tolerance is mirrored by lack or refusal of reporting to authorities.

*Societal level:* At the societal level, poverty was identified by participants as the key “push” factor of online child sexual abuse combined with the availability of resources such as access to internet and cheap mobile phones/laptops that provide opportunities to engage in this form of exploitation. This is further fueled with the populations' proficiency in the use of English language that enables them to transact and communicate with foreign customers easily.
In terms of cultural influence, Filipino family values of *utang na loob* and parental authority are extorted to subject children to this abuse. Additionally, Filipino culture of not wanting to get involved with the matters of other people or having a “mind-your-own business” attitude to avoid being labelled as “nangingialam” or “pakialamero”, and lack of concern or “malasakit” were also identified as risk factors that contribute to lack of reporting and tolerance of this crime in the community.

Participants identified gaps in the current system that hinder the effective delivery of services and interventions to survivors. These gaps are also “risk factors” that make reintegrated survivors susceptible to re-victimization and vulnerable to other forms of abuse. Participants identified limited number of social workers, lack of budget and resources, lack of coordination and collaboration, and lack of capacity, skills, and training of service providers as gaps that affect the quality of assessment, effective delivery of comprehensive services, and continuous monitoring which are crucial factors for the successful reintegration of survivors.

**Factors that Support Successful Reintegration of OSEC Survivors**

This section discusses the factors that contribute to the successful reintegration of survivors. Based on the results, comprehensive pre-reintegration assessment and planning, availability and delivery of comprehensive community-based intervention, continuous follow-up and monitoring, efficient mechanism on OSEC prevention and reporting, and interagency coordination are crucial factors that support the survivors’ successful reintegration. It is vital that interventions address the risk factors that initially made the survivors and their families vulnerable to this form of abuse.

**Comprehensive pre-reintegration assessment and planning**

As discussed in the previous section, one of the major gaps which affects the effective delivery of interventions and services is that assessments are weak and were not done comprehensively. Comprehensive assessment is crucial as it determines the readiness of the survivor to return to the family and the capability of the family to provide and sustain the needs of the child (Asquith & Turner, 2008; Cody, 2017; Muraya & Fry, 2015; Rafferty, 2019). Assessment informs plan, interventions, areas of support, and types of services that are needed to meet the unique needs of the survivors and their family. Participants expressed the need for conducting proper assessment to identify support services and interventions that should be provided.

**Availability of comprehensive community-based intervention:**

There is a need to ensure the comprehensive and holistic delivery of services to the
survivors and their family. When survivors return to their family and community, they might encounter the same risk factors that initially made them vulnerable to this form of abuse. Therefore, it is important that support services and interventions address these risk factors to reduce the risk of re-victimization.

**Psychosocial Support:** Changing the mindset and educating the survivors and their families about online sexual exploitation of children are crucial for the successful reintegration of survivors. As discussed above, the key driving factors of this form of abuse are the belief that it is an easy way to earn money, lack of knowledge and awareness about this crime, neglect and irresponsible parenthood, and survivors’ perception about victimization. A participant mentioned that there is a need to recognize that traffickers and victims earn more money in engaging in this form of exploitation compared to the financial assistance that they will receive. A participant explained:

“We understand that the main cause of OSEC and human trafficking is economic concern, but one thing that we have to acknowledge is that they earn more money in performing OSEC than in the economic assistance they receive from the DSWD, from there we can think of how it can fit [OSEC and RRPTP]. So that, the resources that will be provided to them will not be wasted.” (SP12, a service provider from NCR)

Therefore, in order to lessen the risk that they will go back to this easy-money activity, interventions should prioritize changing the mindset and educating the survivors and their families about OSEC, alongside with economic empowerment. For the family, participants emphasized the importance of conducting Parent Effectiveness Sessions (PES) or Family Development Sessions (FDS) to enhance and improve their knowledge about responsible parenthood. Informants also stressed the need to inform and raise the awareness of the family that online sexual exploitation of children is a crime punishable by law and the harmful or detrimental effects it can inflict to the victims. In addition, family counselling and therapy were also mentioned as a vital support service that should be provided to the family of survivors.

While for the survivors, participants also noted the importance of educating them about online sexual exploitation to reduce the risk of them being re-victimized and becoming operators/facilitators. Informants also stressed that survivors’ psychological needs should be addressed. They need access to mental health services and regular counselling sessions.

**Economic Support [Financial and Livelihood Assistance]:** When survivors return to their families and communities, they are often faced with the same socio-economic factors that made them susceptible to this form of abuse, and the presence of these factors makes them highly vulnerable to re-victimization (Camp et al., 2018; Gill & Tsai, 2018; Lisborg, 2009; Tsai et
Since economic concern is one of the key factors that pushed survivors and their families to resort to this kind of exploitation, economic empowerment, through the provision of economic support such as financial and livelihood assistance, is needed to ensure successful reintegration.

All participants emphasized that the family of the survivors should have access to sustainable livelihood program and stable income that would allow them to support their needs. Informants mentioned that livelihood assistance were provided through starting capital and business development skills. Some highlighted the need for skills training with job referrals or placements. Service providers also mentioned that they should maximize their access to the benefits of RRPTP assistance that provides economic support which includes livelihood, financial, education, and skills to the survivors and their families. Aside from RRPTP, other service providers said that survivors and their families should be included in the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) of the DSWD. Some non-offending family members interviewed also raised the same need for inclusion in 4Ps.

**Educational Assistance:** Majority of the non-offending family respondents identified the need for educational assistance to help the survivor finish his/her studies. Respondents who are grandparents mentioned that because of their old age it would be hard for them to support the survivor's education, while other family members said that they lack the resources to provide the school needs of the child. Likewise, community member respondents said that the survivors should be given an opportunity to access free education and scholarships.

**Continuous monitoring of survivor and family**

Service providers stressed that LGU social workers, barangay, and private service providers should play an active role in monitoring the client and their family in the community. Series of home visits, assessments, and monitoring should be done for updates of survivors' social functioning and situation. Participants mentioned that regular monitoring of the survivors could prevent them from becoming operators and lessen their risk of re-victimization.

**Efficient mechanism on prevention and reporting of online sexual exploitation of children**

Several service provider participants asserted the need to activate and strengthen the Barangay Child Protection Council (BCPC) and Local Council for the Protection of Children (LCPC). Participants emphasized the importance of advocacy efforts and awareness campaign about online sexual exploitation of children in the family and community. Collaboration and partnership with the government, churches, communities, and NGOs are also needed to disseminate information about this form of abuse and to reach wider audience. These campaigns should include information about the laws against this crime, its harmful effects,
and should target the belief system and attitude of the community towards online sexual exploitation. Additionally, informants highlighted the importance of giving parents the opportunity to learn responsible parenthood. They mentioned that orientations and seminars for responsible parenthood should be facilitated in the communities to encourage parents to be vigilant and to monitor the activities of their children.

Moreover, participants stressed the need to conduct programs and symposiums for the youth educating them about cyber safety, their rights, and how they can protect themselves from this form of abuse. Additionally, service providers also mentioned the importance of encouraging the members of the community to report to the authorities any suspected activities of online child sexual abuse in the neighborhood. While on the part of the authorities, immediate response once they received a report is needed. Participants also pointed out the need to intensify the implementation of existing laws or ordinances against this crime in the communities. One service provider mentioned that there are “a lot of good laws, but lack of law enforcement implementation.” (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

Alongside with strengthening the laws and ordinances, community mobilization is also important and there should be coordinators monitoring each area in the barangay. Community members respondents highlighted that there are efforts from their barangays to prevent this crime. Some respondents mentioned that the barangay monitors Internet Cafes, but they also stressed that everyone cannot be monitored since people have their own computers at home. While other informants pointed out that barangays should be provided with technical assistance to effectively implement these laws. They need to be trained and equipped on protecting children and handling victims in the community.

**Interagency Coordination**

Participants emphasized the need to strengthen the collaboration and coordination among different actors and stakeholders from conducting the assessments, delivery of support services and intervention, monitoring, and prevention through advocacy and awareness campaigns. There is a need for mobilization, convergence, and exchange of resources in order to effectively deliver comprehensive services to the survivors and their families to ensure their successful reintegration.

**Systemic Trends: Factors that support successful reintegration**

*Individual level:* In the individual level, educational assistance, access to mental health services, and psychosocial support should be provided to survivors. Awareness-building about online sexual exploitation is also important to lessen the risk of re-victimization.

*Family level:* Changing the mindset and educating the families about online sexual
exploitation are crucial for the successful reintegration of survivors. Participants mentioned that Parent Effectiveness Sessions (PES) or Family Development Sessions (FDS) and family counselling/therapy should be regularly conducted to enhance and improve the parents’ knowledge about responsible parenthood. Further, economic empowerment of the family, through the provision of financial, livelihood, and educational assistance is essential for the sustained reintegration of survivor. Skills training with job referrals or placements should also be provided. Maximizing access to the benefits of RRPTP assistance and inclusion to programs such as 4Ps are also vital.

**Community level:** In the community level, participants emphasized the need to strengthen and activate the BCPC, allocate funds to implement community programs and services, intensify advocacy efforts and awareness campaigns on online sexual exploitation, facilitate orientations and seminars for responsible parenthood, and encourage members of the community to report suspected cases of this crime to the authorities. Moreover, participants also pointed out that barangays need technical assistance and training on protecting children and handling victims in the community.

**Societal level:** At this level, the role of service providers such as properly conducting assessment and planning, delivery of comprehensive community-based services, continuous follow-up and monitoring, interagency collaboration and coordination, and advocacy campaigns/awareness-building about online sexual exploitation of children were identified as factors that contribute to the successful reintegration of survivors. As discussed in the risk factors, there is a need to increase the number of LGU social workers as well as increase capacity-building opportunities for both government and non-government service providers in conducting assessments and case management. Expanding access to Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) and livelihood assistance programs are also important for the economic empowerment of the survivors and their families. Lastly, allocation of funds and resources to execute and sustain reintegration programs is also needed.

**Alternative Care Options if Family Reintegration is Not Possible**

There are cases where reintegration to the family and community is not of the best interest of the child. Findings from multiple studies showed that high percentage of online sexual exploitation cases were facilitated and operated by the biological parents and relatives of the victims (Garcia & Manikan, 2014; IJM, 2020; Terre des Hommes, 2013a), hence returning to the family may not be a viable and safe option for the meantime. Other reasons for not being able to reintegrate to the family and community are: (1) the child was assessed to be vulnerable in the community, or the environment is not suitable for his/her well-being and (2)
the parents are not yet prepared for the return of the child and do not have the capability as well as resources to provide the needs of the child. In these cases, other short- or long-term placements or alternative permanent options must be sought.

**Alternative Permanent Options**

*Independent Living Program:* Service provider participants from all the FGDs identified independent living program as an alternative permanent option for survivors who are 18 years old and above who cannot be reintegrated to their family. Informants said that survivors should be assisted and provided with skills training, job placement, livelihood project, or capital assistance to prepare them for independent living. A service provider mentioned the possible benefit of independent living in reducing the risk for re-victimization, she said:

“So, what we do if it is really impossible for these children to be return back to their families, we have the child to really prepare them for independent living, give them skills. But they are not in the shelter anymore, they will be put in a dormitory, normal, so they build on their own. But then at least they will be somehow prevented from the recurring or re-exploitation from the family. Because if the child is with their family the force is strong, they need money that is why they can be lured or re-used again" (SP7, a service provider from NCR)

Many participants identified that the limited number of organizations that offer independent living programs is a major challenge that they face. One participant narrated:

“...our difficulty now that we have a lot of children who are already 17 and their reintegration is not possible is that there are only few NGOs that provide independent living programs. In this program, you need to have networks of where these children can be trained for their possible employment. I think that’s one thing that the government can look at, since there are very few NGOs” (SP4, a service provider from Region IV-A)

*Kinship Care:* For children, kinship care is the most viable option and has the highest potential to become a permanent home other than reintegration to the biological family. Participants mentioned that this could be an alternative if there is an identified relative who would be willing to care and commit to protect the child. They also stressed the importance of conducting proper assessments, effective delivery of comprehensive support services, and regular monitoring and supervision of the survivor and their relatives.

*Adoption:* Few informants mentioned adoption as a possible permanent option for the survivor since this would only be possible if the biological parents has decided to give up their parental rights for the child. One participant said that the long and rigorous process of adoption is a major challenge.
Alternative Temporary Placement Options

Foster Care (nonrelatives): Many participants also identified foster care as a family-based care option if family reintegration is not possible. Again, they mentioned that comprehensive services should be provided to the child and foster family. However, a lot of challenges on the current foster care system were identified by the participants. One participant mentioned that Filipinos have preferences when choosing a foster child, she said:

“Filipinos are very choosy when it comes to having children. They have preferences. Most of the families choose the kids for their benefit, not really for the benefit of the child, so the needs of the child are not being met.” (SP18, a service provider from Region III)

While another participant mentioned another concern:

“There is a trial custody in foster care. If foster care doesn’t work, they return the kids back. It becomes more traumatic to the child.” (SP17, a service provider from Region III)

There is also an issue on the placement of sibling groups since there is a high probability that they will be separated into different families, a participant explained:

“For example, siblings who are referred to foster care, there are no foster parents who want to welcome all of them. What happens is that the siblings are divided into three families. There’s already a wrong concept. The purpose of reunification is not being served anymore.” (SP20, a service provider from Region III)

Short- or Long-Term Residential Care

Few participants mentioned that the survivor should continuously stay in the shelter if family reintegration is impossible and other family-based alternative care placement options are already exhausted. Participants highlighted the importance of continuous delivery of comprehensive services to the survivors and training them to be independent and self-sufficient while they stay in the shelter.
Recommendations

Based on the results of this research, there is a need to provide separate and tailored interventions for the survivor, family, and community to attain restoration and ensure the successful reintegration of children survivors of online sexual exploitation. It would be beneficial to consider increased attention towards and further development of the following areas:

1. **Increase capacity-building opportunities for non-government and government service providers.** Building the capacity of service providers, specifically trainings focused on the areas of trauma assessments and parent capability assessment are needed to determine and effectively respond to the needs of survivors during the whole reintegration process.

2. **Ensure comprehensive and holistic delivery of community-based interventions and services to survivors and their families.** Intervention and support services that address the unique needs of children survivors of online sexual exploitation and their families should be delivered comprehensively to ensure the survivors’ successful reintegration. The following are the recommended comprehensive post-reintegration services that should be continuously provided to the survivors and their family:
   - Provision of timely psychological and counselling services
   - Provision of educational assistance for the child
   - Livelihood training and assistance, which may include job referrals and placement
   - Conduct Parent Effectiveness Sessions (PES) or Family Development Sessions (FDS)
   - Awareness-building about online sexual exploitation of children and cyber safety education
3. Ensure that regular monitoring and evaluation of reintegrated survivors and their families are implemented.

Continuous and regular monitoring should be done once the survivor is reintegrated to their family and community. The outcomes of the support services and interventions provided should be assessed. Also, the condition, well-being, progress, and social functioning of the survivor in the family and community should be evaluated.

*Identify gaps in data collection:* Documentation of monitoring and evaluation of the survivor. Assessments and indicators as basis of sustained reintegration.

*Timely data entry:* Determine or create an efficient system of documentation of the monitoring and evaluation of service providers to the child and family.

4. **Strengthen advocacy efforts and awareness-building about online sexual exploitation of children in communities.** Interventions should be designed to educate the youth and families in the community on laws against this crime and its harmful effects. It is also recommended to design these interventions based on the norms, belief system, and attitude of the community towards this form of abuse. Collaboration among different stakeholders is needed to effectively disseminate information and reach wider audience.

*Strengthening and Empowerment of Barangay Children Protection Council (BCPC):* Technical assistance and trainings should be provided in barangays to equip them with knowledge and skills on how to protect children and handle children victims of online sexual abuse in the community.

5. **Allocate more funds to implement and sustain reintegration programs and increase the number of LGU social workers.** Findings from this report determined that there are several programs to support the successful reintegration of children survivors of online sexual exploitation, however there is a lack of funds and resources allocated to implement and sustain these programs. There is also a need for increased livelihood assistance programs and to expand access to 4Ps. Results also identified that assessment and case management were not properly conducted, and continuous/regular monitoring of reintegrated survivors were not implemented due to the limited number of LGU social workers. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the number of government service providers to effectively deliver services and monitor the reintegrated survivors in the community.
6. Strengthen and expand the foster care program and independent living program.

Based on the results of this study, independent living for survivors who are 18 years old and above and foster care (kinship) for children survivors are the most viable alternative permanent options for survivors whose family reintegration is not possible.

*Strengthen and expand the foster care program* that would cater the needs of children survivors of online sexual exploitation. Kinship care is the most viable permanent placement other than reintegration to the biological family. Foster care (non-relatives) could also be an option as a temporary placement while waiting for reunification.

*Strengthen and expand independent living programs* and *transitional housing* that prepare survivors who are 18 years old and above for independent living. While staying in residential care facilities, survivors must be capacitated to be self-sufficient to support themselves as a preparation for their transition to independent living.
Conclusion

This report identified the characteristics and risk factors of individual, families, and communities impacted by online sexual exploitation of children as well as the current gaps in the system that affects the effective delivery of interventions and services to survivors. Factors that contribute to successful reintegration were also determined. In addition, there was also a brief discussion on alternative care options for survivors whose family reintegration is not possible.

Future research may delve into the unique needs of children survivors of online sexual exploitation as well as identify the barriers and challenges they encounter in accessing the support services they need to attain restoration and ensure successful reintegration. Additionally, an in-depth analysis on the challenges affecting the service providers’ capacity to provide support services and interventions to survivors including recommendations to address these gaps and barriers may also be conducted.
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APPENDIX A

A STUDY ON ONLINE SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN (OSEC)

AFTERCARE REINTEGRATION MODEL BUILDING

Palatanungan (Family Interview Questionnaire)

Pangalan (Name): ________________________ Edad (Age): _____ Kasarian (Gender): ________

Relasyon sa Bata (Relationship to Child/Client): ________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

Mga Tanong (Questions):

1. Sino-sino ang magkakasama bilang miyembro ng pamilya ni _____________ (pangalan
go bata)? (Who is living together as members of the family of _____________ (client’s
name)?)

______________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Ano ang karaniwang ginagawa ng pamilya sa bahay? (What are the common activities of
the family at home?)

______________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________
3. Sino ang nag-aalaga at paano nito inaalagaan at pinoprotektahan ang mga bata sa bahay? 
(Who takes care and how does he/she take care of and protect the children at home?)
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Ano ang mga gusto at pangangailangan ng pamilya na natutugunan at hindi? Bakit? 
(What are the wants and needs of the family that are provided and not provided? Why?)
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

5. Sa barangay na tinitirhan ng pamilya, ano ang maganda at hindi? Bakit? 
(In the community that the family lives, what is good and not good? Why?)
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

6. Sa iyong pagkakaalam, bakit kinuha ng mga pulis at social workers ang mga bata? Ano ang pakiramdam mo sa mga nangyari? 
(What do you think is the reason why the police and social workers took away the children? How do you feel about it?)
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

7. Ano ang pagkakaalam mo sa online sexual exploitation? Paano ito ginagawa at ano ang karaniwang tawag sa ganitong gawain? 
(What do you know about online sexual exploitation of children? What is this activity called in the family or community?)
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

8. Ano ang nagtulak sa pamilya para gawin ang OSEC (o anumang tawag ng pamilya dito) at paano nila ito maiiwasan? 
(What are the reasons why the families engage in OSEC (or whatever it is called by the family) and how can they prevent it from happening?)
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
9. Sa mga nangyari, ano ang plano ng pamilya sa pagbabalik ng mga bata? Paano ito gagawin at ano ang magiging balakid sa pagtupad ng mga plano na ito? (Given what happened, what are the family’s plan for the reintegration? How can this be done and what will hinder the family in achieving these plans?)

10. Ano ang mga kinakailangang serbisyo ng pamilya para maging handa ito kung ibabalik ang mga bata? (What are the services needed by the family to be prepared for the reintegration of the children?)

11. Paano matutulungan ang pamilya para mapigilan ang OSEC? (How can the family be supported to prevent OSEC?)
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AFTERCARE REINTEGRATION MODEL BUILDING

Palatanungan (Neighbors and Barangay Council Interview Questionnaire)

Pangalan (Name): ___________________________   Edad (Age): _____ Kasarian (Gender): ___________

Mga Tanong (Questions):

1. Ano ang pagkakakilala mo sa pamilya ni _____________ (pangalan ng bata)? (What do you know about his/her family?)

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Paano inaalagaan at pinoprotektahan ang mga bata sa barangay? (How are children being taken care of and protected in the barangay?)

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Ano ang pagkakaalam mo sa online sexual exploitation? Paano ito ginagawa at ano ang karaniwang tawag sa ganitong gawain? (What do you know about online sexual exploitation of children? What is this activity called in the family or community?)

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Ano ang mayroon sa pamilya at barangay na maaaring maging dahilan para magawa ang OSEC (o anumang tawag dito ng ininterbyu)? (What are the factors in the family and community that facilitate OSEC (or whatever it is called by the respondent)?)

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

5. Ano sa tingin mo ang mga programa o serbisyo na maaaring ibigay sa mga batang biktima
ng OSEC kung sila ay ibabalik sa barangay? *What are the supports and services needed by children victims of OSEC as they go back to their community?*

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

6. Ano ang maaaring gawin ng barangay para maiwasan ang OSEC? *What can the community do to help prevent OSEC?*

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
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Palatanungan (IJM and DSWD Partners involved in Rescue Interview Questionnaire)

Pangalan (Name): _________________________  Opisina (Office): _________________________

Mga Tanong (Questions):

1. Ano ang pagkakaalam mo sa online sexual exploitation? Paano ito ginagawa at ano ang karaniwang tawag sa ganitong gawain? (What do you know about online sexual exploitation of children? What is this activity called in the family or community?)
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Ano ang karaniwang reaksyon ng mga bata sa rescue? Bakit? (What are the common reactions of children during rescue operations? Why?)
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Ano ang nalalaman ng mga bata tungkol sa OSEC? Ano ang sinasabi nilang dahilan bakit nila ito ginagawa? (What knowledge do children know about OSEC? What reasons are they saying for doing it or being engaged in OSEC?)
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Ano ang nakita o masasabi mong katangian ng mga batang biktima ng OSEC na nagdala sa kanila sa ganitong sitwasyon? (What are the characteristics of OSEC clients that you think make them vulnerable to this kind of exploitation?)
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________________________________________

5. Ano ang nakita o masasabi mong katangian ng mga batang biktima ng OSEC na makatutulong
sa kanila para malampasan ang kanilang karanasan at maging matagumpay? (What are the characteristics of OSEC clients that you think make them resilient to the exploitation that they experienced?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

6. Ano ang mayroon sa pamilya at barangay na maaaring maging dahilan para magawa ang OSEC? (What are the factors in the family and the community that facilitate OSEC?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

7. Ano sa tingin mo ang mga programa o serbisyo na maaaring ibigay sa mga batang biktima ng OSEC kung sila ay ibabalik sa pamilya at barangay? (What are the supports and services needed by children victims of OSEC as they go back to their family and community?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

8. Ano sa tingin mo ang mga programa o serbisyo na maaaring ibigay sa mga batang biktima ng OSEC na hindi na maaaring maibalik sa kanilang pamilya at barangay? Bakit? Paano ito ipatutupad? (What are the supports and services needed by children victims of OSEC who cannot be reintegrated back to their family and community? Why? How can these be implemented?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
9. Ano ang magagawa ng DSWD at LGU para pigilan at tugunan ang problema ng OSEC sa Pilipinas? (What can DSWD and LGU do to prevent and respond to OSEC problems in the Philippines?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
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Key Informant Interview Questionnaire (Palatanungan)

Pangalan (Name): ________________________________  Opisina (Office): ________________________________

Mga Tanong (Questions):

1. Ano ang pagkakaalam mo sa online sexual exploitation? Paano ito ginagawa at ano ang karaniwang tawag sa ganitong gawain? (What do you know about online sexual exploitation of children? How is it being done and what is it commonly called?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

2. Ano ang nakita o masasabi mong katangian ng mga batang biktima ng OSEC na nagdala sa kanila sa ganitong sitwasyon? (What are the characteristics of OSEC clients that you think make them vulnerable to this kind of exploitation?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Ano ang nakita o masasabi mong katangian ng mga batang biktima ng OSEC na makatutulungan sa kanila para malampasan ang kanilang karanasan at maging matagumpay? (What are the characteristics of OSEC clients that you think make them resilient to the exploitation that they experienced?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Ano ang mayroon sa pamilya at barangay na maaaring maging dahilan para magawa ang OSEC? (What are the factors in the family and the community that facilitate OSEC?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
5. Ano sa tingin mo ang mga programa o serbisyo na maaaring ibigay sa mga batang biktima ng OSEC kung sila ay ibabalik sa pamilya at barangay? (What are the supports and services needed by children victims of OSEC as they go back to their family and community?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

6. Ano sa tingin mo ang mga programa o serbisyo na maaaring ibigay sa mga batang biktima ng OSEC na hindi na maaaring maibalik sa kanilang pamilya at barangay? Bakit? Paano ito ipatutupad? (What are the supports and services needed by children victims of OSEC who cannot be reintegrated back to their family and community? Why? How can these be implemented?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

7. Paano makatutulong ang inyong organisasyon o grupo para suportahan ang programa at mga serbisyo iyong nabanggit? (How can your organization or group best support these programs and services that you mentioned?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

8. Paano makatutulong ang inyong organisasyon o grupo para pigilan at tugunan ang problema sa OSEC? (How can your organization/group best support to prevent and respond to the problems of OSEC?)

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
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Key Information Consent Form

International Justice Mission (IJM) is conducting a research study about the Aftercare Reintegration Model Building on Online Sexual Exploitation of Children (OSEC). We are asking you to be part of this research as a key informant because you have knowledge of reintegration and direct implementation of programs and services relevant to adoption, foster care, family reunification, independent living, and community support services. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to take part in the study.

What the study is about:

The purpose of this study is to develop a useful model for case management particularly on reintegration that will significantly and sustainably address OSEC victimization in the Philippines and improve restoration outcomes for OSEC survivors in the Philippines.

Location of the study:

This study is set to be conducted in Regions 3, 4-A, 7, and the National Capital Region (NCR) in the Philippines.

Dates of the study:

The study will be completed from February 2018 to March 2018.

Methods and procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to undergo one-on-one interviews as part of the data gathering for this research. It is estimated that the interview will take 30 to 45 minutes to complete. There is no follow-up planned.
Key informant payment or costs:

There is no cost or incentive associated with participation in this study. Taking part in this research is completely voluntary. Your decision to participate will not affect your current or future relationship with IJM and the recommendations of the IJM Aftercare team.

Key informant confidentiality:

Names or other identifiers will be collected only for the purpose of this research and will not be shared nor distributed to other individuals outside the IJM Aftercare research team. All interviews will be maintained in secure location at IJM and will be destroyed after data analysis is completed. The researcher, the IJM Aftercare research team and, as needed, the IJM executives will be the only ones who will have access to the records.

Potential risks to key informant:

A potential risk may be the loss of time that may cause discomfort for a key informant. A perceived invasion of privacy may cause discomfort as well as key informants will be asked about their knowledge on OSEC. The confidential nature of the interview will attempt to minimize risks.

Risk/benefit ratio:

The estimated level of risk is minimal. The benefits to the study are that the key informants will be able to assist the researcher in learning about risk and resiliency factors that contribute to online sexual exploitation victimization and re-victimization of children in the Philippines.

SIGNATURES

I have read this consent form and my questions have been answered. My signature below means that I do want to be part of this research. I know that I can remove myself from the study without any problems.

____________________________________________________________  ___________________________
Key Informant's Complete Name (in print)     Date

____________________________________________________________  ___________________________
Key Informant's Signature       Date Signed

____________________________________________________________  ___________________________
Researcher's Signature        Date Signed

This consent form will be kept by IJM for at least three years beyond the end of the study.
INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE MISSION PROTECTS PEOPLE IN POVERTY FROM VIOLENCE BY RESCUING VICTIMS, BRINGING CRIMINALS TO JUSTICE, RESTORING SURVIVORS TO SAFETY AND STRENGTH, AND HELPING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT BUILD A SAFE FUTURE THAT LASTS.
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