Regional Stakeholders' Consultation and Planning Workshop on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Sexual Abuse in the Pacific

# A Pacific Regional Report











19-21 November 2007
Suva, Fiji

UNITED NATIONS
ESCAP
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The secretariat of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) is the regional development arm of the United Nations and serves as the main economic and social development centre for the United Nations in Asia and the Pacific. Its mandate is to foster cooperation between its 53 members and 9 associate members. It provides the strategic link between global and country-level programmes and issues. It supports Governments of countries in the region in consolidating regional positions and advocates regional approaches to meeting the region's unique socio-economic challenges in a globalizing world. The ESCAP secretariat is located in Bangkok, Thailand. Please visit the ESCAP website at <www.unescap.org> for further information.



*The shaded areas of the map indicate ESCAP members and associate members.*

# Regional Stakeholders' Consultation and Planning Workshop on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Sexual Abuse in the Pacific

## A Pacific Regional Report

**19-21 November 2007**
**Suva, Fiji**

UNITED NATIONS
ESCAP
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

# Regional Stakeholders' Consultation and Planning Workshop on the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Sexual Abuse in the Pacific

## A Pacific Regional Report

United Nations publication
Sales No. E.08.II.F.18
Copyright © United Nations 2008
ISBN: 978-92-1-120551-0
ST/ESCAP/2511

This manuscript has been prepared by the Social Development Division of the ESCAP secretariat. It may not be reproduced or reprinted without the express permission of the United Nations. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Secretariat.

References have, wherever possible, been verified.

This publication has been issued without formal editing.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ESCAP wishes to thank John Errington, Acting Chief Executive Officer for Save the Children Fiji for organizing the workshop and in particular Lynette Petueli and her team of Iris Low, Susie Anise, Rachana Kumari, Sera Vulavou, Veena Singh, Courtney Underwood and Alika Cooper for managing all travel and logistical arrangements and servicing the meeting. Thanks also to Frances Pene for her role as rapporteur and writer of the meeting report.

# CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** | | iii |
| **ABBREVIATIONS** | | vii |
| **I.** | **INTRODUCTION TO THE REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS' CONSULTATION AND PLANNING WORKSHOP** | 1 |
| | A. Background | 1 |
| | B. Overview of the meeting | 2 |
| | C. Purpose of the workshop | 4 |
| **II.** | **REVIEW OF SITUATION ANALYSIS REPORTS BY PACIFIC STAKEHOLDERS** | 5 |
| | A. Towards a common understanding of the commercial sexual exploitation of children | 5 |
| | B. Country situation analysis reports | 6 |
| | C. Pacific stakeholders' response to the country reports | 12 |
| | D. Assessing regional trends: Overview of the studies and the Pacific context by leading Pacific regional organizations | 13 |
| **III.** | **RESPONDING TO COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN: NATIONAL PLANS OF ACTION** | 17 |
| | A. Role and purpose of a national plan of action | 17 |
| | B. Experience of national plan development of Papua New Guinea | 18 |
| | C. Developing national plans of action | 18 |
| | D. Draft national plans of action: Group activity reports | 19 |
| | E. Analysis of key interventions | 22 |
| | F. Recovery and reintegration reports | 24 |
| | G. Summing up | 27 |
| | H. Participants' comments on draft national plans of action | 27 |
| **IV.** | **THE WAY FORWARD** | 29 |
| | A. Pacific responses to CSEC: What is needed? | 29 |
| | B. Country strategies | 29 |
| | C. Regional organizations and responses to commercial sexual exploitation of children | 32 |
| | D. Round table: Response to country strategies by representatives of Pacific regional organizations and other United Nations agencies | 34 |
| **V.** | **CONCLUSION OF THE WORKSHOP** | 37 |

## CONTENTS *(continued)*


*Page*

**APPENDICES**

I: Provisional programme ..... 38

II: Case study prepared by ECPAT for planning exercise on commercial sexual exploitation of children and child sexual abuse ..... 41

III: Matrix for drafting a national plan of action/country strategic plan against CSEC for the imaginary island, "Pacifica" ..... 43

IV: Media release ..... 48

V: List of participants, facilitators and resource persons ..... 50

VI: Pacific Statement of Commitment ..... 55

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| CSA | Child sexual abuse |
| CSEC | Commercial sexual exploitation of children |
| ECPAT International | End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes – International |
| ESCAP | United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
| HIV and AIDS | Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| MOU | Memorandum of understanding |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |

# I INTRODUCTION TO THE REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS' CONSULTATION AND PLANNING WORKSHOP[1]

## A. Background

In September 2003, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), the End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes (ECPAT) International network and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) organized a meeting in Nadi, Fiji on combating poverty and commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC), with a focus on helping countries to incorporate their obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Stockholm Commitments from the first World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (1996) into national action plans. A Pacific Statement of Commitment was also adopted at that workshop. Participating countries expressed their interest in receiving assistance in order to undertake situation analyses research so that they could know the true extent of the problem and its particular manifestations in the Pacific.

In response, a training workshop on methodologies for researching CSEC and child sex abuse (CSA) was organized. Between 2004 and 2007, ESCAP, ECPAT and UNICEF subsequently supported the situation analysis research in a number of Pacific island countries, namely:

- Cook Islands: funded by ESCAP and ECPAT-New Zealand; research jointly carried out by ECPAT-New Zealand and the Cook Islands Women's Counselling Centre, Punanga Tauturu Inc. (PTI), 2006
- Fiji: funded by ESCAP; research by Save the Children Fiji, November 2004
- Kiribati: funded by UNICEF; research by Regional Rights Resources Team, November 2004
- Papua New Guinea: funded by UNICEF and ESCAP; carried out by HELP Resources, Inc., January 2005
- Samoa: funded by UNICEF; research has been completed and a report is being written
- Solomon Islands: funded by UNICEF; research by the Christian Care Centre of the Church of Melanesia, Honiara with technical assistance provided by Regional Rights Resource team, October 2004
- Vanuatu: funded by UNICEF; research by Wan Smol Bag Theatre with technical assistance from Regional Rights Resource Team, November 2004.

In December 2006, a regional report on CSEC, based on the national situation analysis reports that had been completed by mid-year 2006, was launched in Fiji by the Pacific office of UNICEF and the Pacific Operations Centre of ESCAP with the involvement of ECPAT International.

Since the completion of the studies and the launch of the regional report in December 2006, those countries had not met to discuss the CSEC research findings and appropriate responses. Therefore, ESCAP, ECPAT and Save the Children Fiji decided to organize a stakeholders' consultation and planning workshop from 19 to 21 November 2007 in Suva, Fiji, to enable all the countries in which situation analysis studies had been undertaken to meet and consider possible strategies and policies, including national action plans to respond to CSEC. It was

[1] ESCAP, as a regional organization, refers to the Pacific as a "sub-regional"; however, in this publication, the word "region" or "regional" refers to the Pacific.

hoped that the workshop would provide a forum for participants to consider an appropriate regional response and mechanisms for information sharing. The Consultation also presented the social and economic factors behind CSEC, root causes and gender issues that were documented in the studies.

Part of the workshop was led by ECPAT and focused on strengthening the capacity of representatives from Government and civil society to develop national plans of action on CSEC for putting into place policies, programmes, laws and strategies covering prevention, protection, recovery and reintegration and child participation, as called for in the Stockholm Agenda for Action adopted in 1996 at the First World Congress against the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children.

Participants included government and non-governmental organizations from Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, as well as Pacific regional organizations and academic institutions and United Nations organizations. The following is the proceedings of the meeting.

## B. Overview of the meeting

The meeting began on 19 November 2007. On behalf of the partner organizations – ESCAP, ECPAT International and Save the Children Fiji – Ms. Lynette Petueli, Programmes Manager for Save the Children Fiji, welcomed the guests and participants to the workshop. She then invited Mr. John Errington, Acting Chief Executive Officer for Save the Children Fiji, to open the workshop.

In his opening remarks, Mr. Errington recalled the situation in the United Kingdom, where child protection dominated the work of child care and where non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were spearheading the struggle against child poverty and the breakdown of community life. On recently taking up his acting appointment at Save the Children Fiji, Mr. Errington found that the situation in Fiji was not dissimilar. Abuse of children was increasing, and there were risk factors such as widespread poverty and parents finding it hard to balance child care with economic survival. He noted that there was an urgent need to strengthen community life and make communities resilient to pressures from outside which could lead to child abuse. As Chair of the proceedings for the first day, he then invited the representatives from the partner organizations to make their opening statements.

Ms. Vanessa Griffen presented the opening remarks for Ms. Thelma Kay, Chief, Social Development Division, ESCAP, Bangkok. It was noted, that against the background of a youthful population living through times of social, political and economic change, with inadequate opportunities to express their concerns, it was clear that Governments, NGOs and individuals must confront some of the more difficult problems facing children and youth today. Those included attitudes, customs and practices that perpetuated violence against and exploitation of women, girls and boys. The factors that contributed to the high suicide rates among youth were also of concern, as were new forms of child abuse and exploitation.

Ms. Griffen explained that CSEC and CSA had been firmly placed on the global agenda since 1996, when the first World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children was held in Stockholm. Since then, ESCAP, ECPAT and UNICEF had worked in partnership in the Pacific to raise those issues through regional workshops and to support the national situation analyses reports that had been done in the countries represented at the Consultation.

She acknowledged the generous support of the Government of Japan, through which the Regional Stakeholders' Consultation had been made possible. Japan had played a very important role and expressed its commitment to the elimination of CSEC by hosting the Second World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in Yokohama, Japan. It was at that Congress that the Yokohama Global Commitment 2001 was adopted by participating countries, which committed them to reinforce their efforts against CSEC, in particular by addressing the *root causes* that put children at risk of exploitation and by adopting comprehensive measures.

The long history of the work on the issue in the Pacific was noted. It had begun in 2003 with ESCAP, ECPAT and UNICEF working in partnership to organize workshops and support the studies on CSA and CSEC. Countries represented at the workshop had begun research in 2004 to learn more about the extent to which CSEC and CSA were problems in the Pacific. The fact that the studies had been undertaken reflected the commitment of the Pacific countries to address those issues.

Ms. Griffen related that the Consultation was the first opportunity for the countries present to respond to the CSEC situation analysis findings from a national as well as regional perspective, to discuss how to deal with common risk factors, to share experiences and consider national strategies and plans of action needed to address CSEC and CSA as documented in the studies. Ms. Griffen welcomed the opportunity, working in partnership with ECPAT and Save the Children Fiji, to share the findings of those Pacific studies with representatives from civil society, regional organizations and other United Nations agencies.

Ms. Kritsana Pimonsaengsuriya of ECPAT International then described the key role of ECPAT in advocating for the elimination of CSEC around the world. ECPAT groups work with Governments, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations, and other key stakeholders, including church groups, children and young people, to address issues of CSEC in their countries.

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya drew attention to some of the important issues contributing to CSEC. Poverty played an important part; children were even more vulnerable to physical and sexual abuses and exploitation in situations of poverty. The adequacy of protection mechanisms in a country was another key issue. Where they were inadequate, children were more at risk. Moreover, it was found that when children experienced sexual abuse, they were even more vulnerable to commercial sexual exploitation.

Children could be vulnerable to commercial sexual exploitation when mechanisms to protect them were inadequate in the development strategies of a country, for example, when facilities available in tourist destinations were used for the sexual exploitation of children. Children were also being filmed for the production of child pornography, often without their knowledge.

In order to address those complex issues, multi-sectoral initiatives and strong commitments from all related parties at regional and national levels were required. Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya and her colleague, Mr. Tom Shafer, hoped that the workshop would be an opportunity to build upon existing work and efforts to protect children, and that the plans of action participants would begin work on would be transformed into action that would broaden collaboration between the relevant stakeholders and regional organizations to ensure maximum protection of children from commercial sexual exploitation.

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya affirmed that ECPAT was committed to support work to eliminate CSEC in the Pacific through its partnership with ESCAP and UNICEF. The Consultation was an important step in the region's commitment and participation in global efforts to stop the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

UNICEF, the third inter-agency partner, also addressed the meeting. Ms. Johanna Eriksson Takyo expressed the gratitude of UNICEF Pacific to ECPAT and ESCAP for taking the initiative to highlight the issue of the crimes of CSEC and CSA and the need for action in the Pacific. She pointed out that sexual violence had a severe developmental effect on children, the family and ultimately society. CSEC was a global problem and since the first World Congress against the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in 1996, there had been a great deal of progress in raising global awareness and in concerted efforts by Governments, civil society, United Nations agencies and individuals to address CSEC.

In the Pacific, situation analyses had been carried out and the findings compiled in a synthesis report.[2] That report offered compelling proof of sexual exploitation and abuse of children in the Pacific. With a better understanding of the situation, workshop participants would be in good position to develop country-specific strategies and plans to address the issue.

Ms. Eriksson Takyo informed the participants about the new five-year (2008-2013) multi-country programme of UNICEF, of which a core part was the Child Protection Programme. That programme would address symptoms and causes of child protection violations and would build response systems. She expressed the hope that recommendations from the Consultation could be reflected in the Country Programme Action Plans and annual work plans currently being developed by UNICEF.

[2] UNESCAP, UNICEF and ECPAT International, "Child Sexual Abuse and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the Pacific", Suva, Fiji 2006.

## C. Purpose of the workshop

The purpose of the workshop was to bring stakeholders from Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu together to review key findings from the situation analyses of CSEC and CSA, to share experiences, to consider key elements of national plans of action, and to inform other Pacific stakeholders and involve them in responses to CSEC and CSA. The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Review actions already taken and plans or strategies developed on CSA and CSEC and consider ways of improving their impact through identifying synergies between various approaches and plans;
- Enable country representatives to review plans and strategies to address the key research findings for each country;
- Raise awareness of the gender dimensions documented in the situation analyses and the need to incorporate a gender approach for effective responses to CSEC and CSA; and
- Consider the economic and social root causes and the consequences of CSEC and CSA.

Participants from the Pacific and representatives of regional organizations and observers introduced themselves. Both Government and non-governmental representatives were selected from the seven participating Pacific countries to discuss national strategies. Also present were representatives of invited regional organizations, including the University of the South Pacific, Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International, United Nations agencies and the host organization, Save the Children Fiji.

# II REVIEW OF SITUATION ANALYSIS REPORTS BY PACIFIC STAKEHOLDERS

## A. Towards a common understanding of the commercial sexual exploitation of children

The session began with a presentation by Ms. Kritsana Pimonsaengsuriya that set the stage for the seven participating countries to present their CSEC studies and then work on national actions plans. She described the work of ECPAT International, a global network of 81 member groups (organizations and individuals) in 73 countries working together to eliminate the commercial sexual exploitation of children. It sought to encourage the international community to ensure that children everywhere enjoyed their fundamental rights. Since the 1996 first World Congress against the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, ECPAT had promoted and monitored the implementation of the Stockholm Declaration and Agenda for Action by lobbying, advocacy and reporting on progress, which was presented in Global Monitoring Reports on the Status of Action against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children. Local ECPAT groups were involved in lobbying for and supporting the development and implementation of national plans of action to combat CSEC.

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya next focused on the need for a common understanding of what constituted CSEC and CSA. The commercial sexual exploitation of children could be defined as the use of children for sexual gratification for remuneration in cash or kind to the child or a third person (or persons) who has control over the child, which made the child a sexual object and a sexual commodity. It constituted a form of coercion and violence, amounted to forced labour and was a contemporary form of slavery. The victims were boys and girls under 18 years of age and came from all walks of life and socio-economic backgrounds.

The main manifestations of CSEC were child prostitution, child pornography and trafficking of children for sexual purposes. Other manifestations included child sex tourism and child marriage. Child prostitution involved the exchange of money, gifts (such as clothes or food) or favours (such as good grades at school) for sex. Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya stressed that children do not choose to be commercially sexually exploited.

Child pornography involved images, sound recordings and written words which were shared or traded. Perpetrators used a variety of media: the Internet, websites, chat rooms, news groups, e-mails, mobile phones, DVDs and films as well as printed material. In some cases, there was a need to strengthen legislation to provide better protection to children. For example, many laws relating to child protection dealt only with real children, and it had been debated whether or not virtual child pornography[3] was a crime, as there was no real victim of a specified age. Nevertheless, research showed a clear link between child pornography and sexual abuse; the desire for sex with real children was triggered, whether or not the image of the child was "real".

There were a number of reasons for child trafficking. They included child labour, organ transplants, illegal adoption and sex. Trafficking occurred within and between countries and over short and long distances. Whether children were tricked or forced to move, or went willingly, as Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya pointed out, any presumed consent was not considered valid since children were minors.

The main features of child sexual abuse included that the child was an object of sexual gratification for others, which did not always involve bodily contact, for example, in cases of exhibitionism or voyeurism. The abuser was usually known to the child. Where a stranger was involved, he or she would typically begin some form of grooming to get to know the child, and force or pressure was used when committing the offence. Child sexual abuse was always an abuse of power.

---

[3] The definition of child pornography varies from country to country, but may include sexualized images of children that have been digitally altered or distorted and of bodies so that they are no longer identifiable children.

Some features were common to both CSEC and CSA, and many victims of CSEC were also victims of CSA. Victims of both were often afraid to report the offence, and therapeutic techniques could help support some of the victims of both CSEC and CSA.

There were also some differences between CSEC and CSA. The victims of CSA tended to be more withdrawn, whereas the victims of CSEC tended to be louder, more manipulative and violent when having emotional outbursts. Abusers also differed, as victims of sexual abuse encountered fewer abusers than victims of commercial sexual exploitation. Other differences concerned potential victims and the extent to which the victims realized they had been abused (CSA victims generally considered themselves to be victims, whereas CSEC victims often did not), the need for social support and livelihood development, and the fact that, in most cases, CSEC victims were blamed and treated as criminals.

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya described the need for national plans of action specifically focused on CSEC in order to respond to and eliminate CSEC. Developing a national plan also enabled a multi-disciplinary, multi-agency approach with input from all stakeholders, including children, families, churches, United Nations agencies and communities.

## B. Country situation analysis reports

Ms. Griffen gave a regional overview of the CSEC studies, including a progress report since the 2003 meeting in Nadi, Fiji, at which Pacific countries in attendance requested assistance in finding out more about CSEC in their countries. She also gave an overview of how CSEC had been placed on global and regional agendas.

The General Assembly, by its resolution A/50/81 of 14 December 1995, adopted the *World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond,* which called upon Governments to cooperate at the international level and take effective steps, including specific preventive measures, to protect children, adolescents and youth from all types of exploitation and abuse. In 1996, the Asia-Pacific Meeting on Human Resources Development for Youth, convened by ESCAP in Beijing, called on ESCAP to promote regional cooperation in eliminating sexual exploitation and abuse of youth in the region.

The Stockholm Declaration and Agenda for Action against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children was adopted and signed by 122 Governments in August 1996. In the following year, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific adopted resolution 53/4 of 30 April 1997 on "Elimination of sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and youth in Asia and the Pacific". That resolution also recognized the use of new communications technologies, including the Internet, in the commercial and sexual exploitation of children and raised the need for international and regional action on the issue.

In 2001, ECPAT, ESCAP and UNICEF, in partnership with the Government of Japan, co-organized the East Asia and Pacific Regional Consultation for the Second World Congress in Bangkok. At the Consultation, participants adopted the Regional Commitment and Action Plan of the East Asia and Pacific Region against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children. Participating countries requested ECPAT International, ESCAP and UNICEF to monitor the implementation of the Stockholm Declaration and Agenda for Action, adopted by the first World Congress, by assisting countries with the development of national plans of action. Pacific island countries were especially encouraged to adopt the Stockholm Agenda for Action.

The Second World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children was held in 2001 in Yokohama, Japan. Thirty-five States which had not attended the first World Congress participated in the Second Congress. One of the main outcomes was a re-commitment to the Stockholm Agenda for Action, bringing the number of States that committed themselves to the Agenda for Action in 2001 to 159. By mid-2006, the number had risen to 161 States, including several Pacific islands countries.[4]

[4] The Agenda for Action was adopted by Tonga in 1999; by the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu in December 2001; by Cook Islands in September 2003; and by Papua New Guinea in May 2004.

In September 2003, ESCAP, ECPAT and UNICEF organized the Pacific Regional Workshop on Combating Poverty and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth. The workshop was held in Nadi, Fiji, and focused on helping countries to incorporate their obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and Stockholm commitments into national strategies. A Pacific Statement of Commitment was also adopted at that workshop.

One of the key suggestions that came out of the workshop was to conduct situation analyses in Pacific island countries and to share the findings regionally, as at that time, many Pacific islands countries did not know the situation of CSEC in their countries. In response to that suggestion, a training workshop on researching CSEC and CSA was held in 2004 to enable countries to undertake situation analysis research. Since 2004 to the present, ESCAP, ECPAT and UNICEF had supported the situation analysis research, and representatives from the seven Pacific countries were now convened to share the findings of the country situations with one another.

Ms. Griffen said that although the reports had been criticized by some commentators for the variation in methodologies and for their lack of data, those situation analyses were preliminary studies conducted by various organizations that documented a difficult issue in their respective countries. The studies were a start to understanding and responding to CSEC in Pacific island States. While for many of the organizations it was the first time they had carried out such research, they had been active in responding to child protection issues. The studies were not intended to represent detailed concluding research but were meant to highlight the existence of CSEC in each country and to invite further research and action.

***Country reports***

The countries' presentations were made by both government and non-governmental participants who had shared information from their situation analysis reports and agreed on priority issues to present. Government and civil society representatives also gave additional comments on the CSEC situation analysis based on their respective positions of involvement. Some NGO participants present had conducted the research or been on the research team for the country situation analysis research on CSEC and CSA.

*Cook Islands*

Members of the Cook Islands delegation were: Mr. Kenneth Ben, Commissioner to the World Mission of Evangelism; Ms. Angie Tuara Ne Tara, Vice President, Cook Islands Women's Counselling Centre, Punanga Tauturu Inc.; Ms. Apii Angelo Enua, Violence against Women and Children, Cook Islands Women's Counselling Centre, Punanga Tauturu Inc.; and Ms. Mittane-O-Kairangi Daniela, Child and Youth Officer, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Social Services.

The Cook Islands report began with salient facts about the country: 15 islands spread over two million square miles of ocean, a population of 20,200 (June 2007) and a flourishing tourism industry.

The Ministry of Justice had recorded twelve cases of CSEC between 2002 and 2005, and in 2007 there had been one case, that of a former church minister who was convicted of ten sex crimes. There were some cases of sexual abuse and exploitation reported from the outer islands. In general, the victims know the perpetrator.

Protective measures which existed in Cook Islands included: the Prevention of Juvenile Crime Amendments Act of 1968; the 1969 Crimes Act, the Education Act of 1986/7, the Industrial and Labour Ordinance and Labour Bill on Child Labour and the Crimes Amendment Act of 2003.

The Prevention of Juvenile Crime Amendments Act of 1968 and the Juvenile Crimes Prevention Committee (JCPC) were undergoing review by the Ministry of Justice and Crown Law Office in order to deal more effectively with children and youth at risk. The JCPC would be transferred to the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Social Services. Currently, the Child and Family Services Division dealt with all issues related to children and their families.

The Cook Islands National Youth Policy 2007 – 2010 was launched and endorsed in 2007. It was a strategic framework for youth development and aimed to encourage participation of youth (those aged 15 to 35 years) in the development of the country.

The Ministry of Police had revived its Domestic Violence Unit in 2006. Staff was currently in on-going training with the New Zealand Police and was providing awareness programmes to communities, church groups and schools. The Ministry of Education, with support from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, was dealing with school truancy.

Cook Islands had become a signatory to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women through New Zealand's accession in 1985 and became a party in its own right in 2006. Cook Islands had ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1997 and had adopted the Stockholm Agenda for Action in 2003.

In terms of the way forward, there was also a need to review legislation. Until recently, there had been no legal measures to protect children against trafficking. The Police Department had drafted the proposed new Bill on sexual offences, which deals with all CSEC and CSA-related crimes. The Bill awaited endorsement by Crown Law Office and the Cabinet. Also needed was funding to support crime prevention activities relating to exploitation of children, and community training and workshops to raise awareness of CSEC issues.

As far as issues and challenges in compiling the situation analysis, a participant who had been involved in the Cook Islands research commented that it was important that the terminology used in CSEC and CSA was the same across the region so that everyone would have a common understanding of the terms. Cook Islands also reported that:

- The church and men's advocacy groups were very supportive of CSEC community work and the researchers found them very helpful.
- There needed to be more awareness of CSEC and CSA among the Government ministries. Awareness of child sexual abuse and trafficking was developing slowly, but the responsibility of the Censorship Office was not improving at all on the issue of child pornography. Laws had no teeth. The Government needed to give CSEC issues top priority and ensure that the issue becomes part of the Government's strategic and business plans.
- People with disabilities were found to be vulnerable,
- It was also found that the incidence of sexually transmitted infections rose after major sporting events.
- There was a dearth of support systems in place in the outer islands for responding to CSA and CSEC.
- The matter of adoption of children was problematic. It had been common practice for children to be adopted by foreigners with very few questions asked and very little follow-up support.

*Fiji*

Members of the Fiji delegation were: Mrs. Litia Mawi, Permanent Secretary, Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing; Mrs. Iisapeci Rokotuinidau, Director for Social Welfare, Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing; Mrs. Arieta Tagiveitaua, Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing; Ms. Sova Colavanua, Legal Officer, Fiji Human Rights Commission; Ms. Marjorie Whippy, Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing; Inspector Salaseini Vakatuturagani, Officer in Charge, Nabua Police Station, Fiji Police Force; Ms. Sera Bogitini, Project Officer, Fiji Women's Crisis Centre; Ms. Iris Low, Child Rights Manager, Save the Children Fiji; and Ms. Lynette Petueli, Programs Manager, Save the Children Fiji.

Ms. Petueli, who presented Fiji's country report on CSEC, began by explaining that the situation analysis research objectives were to document the existing situation with regard to CSEC and CSA, to identify the causes and risk factors surrounding the issue, and to document and analyze government, civil society and country-based international organizations' roles, related interventions and the level of coordination on CSEC and CSA in Fiji. Limitations of the study included a lack of local information, communication barriers, the difficulty of translating CSEC terms into the vernaculars of Fiji, and time constraints.

The study found that the types of CSEC in Fiji were prostitution, pornography, "sinister" adoption, early marriage and child sex tourism. The evidence of child sex tourism was anecdotal, but there was growing concern, as developing countries were ideal destinations for perpetrators. Children living in poverty or in violent

situations, children with disabilities, unsupervised children and children billeted with relatives were at risk. Children were at increased risk of sexual abuse and commercial sexual exploitation from the growing number of tourists when protection of children was inadequate.

Perpetrators were found to be mainly local and expatriate males acting as facilitators or middlemen (although not all were in fact men). In the case of "situational" commercial sexual exploitation of children, the most common perpetrators were also reported to be men, both local and expatriate.

Ms. Petueli also pointed out a discrepancy in Fijian law in that the minimum age for marriage. Marriage with parental consent was set at 16 for girls, but 18 for boys. Since under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, a girl at 16 was still a child, marriage at that age constituted early marriage, which was sometimes considered a form of CSEC.

The types of sexual abuse child of children included rape, incest, molestation, domestic sexual and physical abuse, sodomy, paedophilia and witnessing third party involvement. The risk factors included a violent or dysfunctional environment, a lack of education and awareness on the issue of child sexual abuse and child neglect. Individual push factors were found to be a lack of education and hence employment opportunities, parental neglect, and advertisements for material goods focusing on children and young people, which lead many young people to want money for consumer items, such as the latest mobile phone and fashionable clothes.

The study explored the linkages between CSA and CSEC. It confirmed that CSA victims were vulnerable to forms of CSEC such as prostitution, and that the incidence of male perpetrators was significant in both CSEC and CSA. It also found that CSA and CSEC occurred in both rural and urban areas. The study made 16 recommendations towards combating CSEC and CSA and recommended a response strategy that was multi-faceted and targeted at different levels of society.

*Kiribati*

Members of the Kiribati delegation were: Ms. Kakiateiti Erikate, Child Protection Manager, Community Development Services, Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs; Mr. Teuraki Ukenio, Acting Deputy Director, Community Development Services Division, Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs; and Ms. Roko Timeon, Director of the Kiribati Association of NGOs – KANGO.

One of the representatives from Kiribati began by explaining to workshop participants that the Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs was responsible for dealing with CSEC in Kiribati. Other organizations involved were the Kiribati Association of NGOs, the Kiribati National Advisory Council of Children, the Kiribati UNICEF Office and several international organizations.

The Kiribati study was very comprehensive and provided important information. It established that both CSEC and CSA were occurring, being reported and were considered a serious problem. A major finding was that of young women commercial sex workers associated with foreign fishing vessels (locally known as *te korekorea*).

Regarding programmes and policies in place, the Kiribati Government enacted the Incorporated Societies Act in 2002 under which the Kiribati Association of NGOs was legally registered. The Government worked closely with and supported the Kiribati Association of NGOs in addressing CSEC and CSA. Both the Government and that association had been very active, before and after the CSEC study. Collaboration between the Kiribati Association of NGOs and church organizations, along with government support, gives Kiribati the ability and capacity to address CSEC and CSA.

Programmes and policies of the Kiribati Association of NGOs included community policing, which was supported by the judiciary by receiving legal status to prosecute perpetrators. Work was also being done by the Kiribati Counselling Association, which counseled both offender and victim; Alcoholics Anonymous and Family Recovery, which supported the offender and family; as well as women's organizations and youth organizations, both community and church-based.

Kiribati Government programmes and policies on CSEC included: ratification of the Convention on the Right of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; Cabinet endorsement of the establishment of the Kiribati National Advisory Council of Children; the establishment of the

new Ministry of Women, Youth and Social Affairs; collective collaboration with senior church-based organizations, the Senior Citizen's Organization and other NGOs which address youth problems; recruitment in 2005 of Island Council Welfare Officers, trained by the Regional Rights Resource Team; and annual budget allocation for addressing CSEC and CSA issues as well as awareness programmes.

Kiribati had been assisted by UNICEF through its Child Protection Project and Child Protection Plan. In addition, a Youth Panel had just been established to facilitate youth participation and a Juvenile Task Force which included NGOs, had been set up. There had been a juvenile justice workshop attended by NGOs, which proved very effective. Other initiatives included a gender-based violence project and Safer Kiribati, organized by the Police Force.

In the future, the Government planned (a) to implement the outcome of the juvenile justice workshop, (b) to consider plans to establish a youth court and (c) to review national laws in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child. NGO plans included (a) a review of legislation on pornography and prostitution, and (b) funding to sustain the work of the Kiribati Counselling Association.

*Samoa*

Members of the Samoan delegation were: Ms. Kuiniselani Tago, Assistant Chief Executive Officer, Division for Women, Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development; Ms. Salanieta Uesele, Administrative Officer/ Chief Executive Officer, Mapusaga O Aiga Inc, Family Haven; and Ms. Ana Kolia, Assistant Secretary of National Council of Churches in Samoa.

Ms. Tago presented Samoa's report. While its situation analysis was not complete at the time of the workshop, representatives of Samoa informed the workshop participants on the ways CSEC and CSA were being dealt with, their challenges and plans.

Samoa ratified the Convention on the Right of the Child in 1994. The Ministry of Women Affairs – now the realigned Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development – had become the national focal point for the Convention and since then, the Convention on the Rights of the Child had continued to provide the overarching framework whereby work on children's rights was being realized.

After the 2003 Pacific Regional Workshop on Combating Poverty and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth, held in Nadi, Fiji, one of the immediate activities as documented in Samoa's CSEC Plan of Action was the conduct of the National Forum on CSEC, targeting community leaders. At the Forum, community leaders were, for the first time, brought together to talk about CSEC.

After that process, CSEC and CSA continued to be addressed through the work on the Convention on the Rights of the Child, for example the work of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme. The work on advancing economic opportunities for women also contributed to combating hardship and/or poverty for children through providing training for women to facilitate their own income-generating activities to support themselves and their families.

In 2005, Samoa had drafted a National Policy for Children through financial assistance from the World Health Organization (WHO) Healthy Environments for Children Alliance. That policy, while not yet endorsed by the Cabinet, was the overarching framework which brought together all the efforts of the different organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, that work towards ensuring a protective environment for children.

In 2006, the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development initiated the Legislative Compliance Review on the Convention on the Rights of the Child for Samoa, which had provided the Government with guidance on how to improve Convention-related work in line with the Samoan context. In the same year, the UNICEF Child Protection Programme was expanded to include child exploitation in addition to child abuse and neglect. That offered the opportunity to focus on CSEC issues. Also in 2006, with assistance from UNICEF, Samoa completed an update of its 1996 Situational Analysis for Women and Children.

In July 2007, UNICEF initiated the development of its five-year Country Programme Action Plan on Child Protection. For Samoa, the development of that plan was still a work in progress. The Division for Women, as the coordinating body for the programme, had always maintained that that programme was to be implemented in

the context of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as that was the way to facilitate Government ownership and consequently the sustainability of the programme. Hence, it was Samoa's proposal to UNICEF to utilize the five-year plan as Samoa's National Plan of Action for the next five years in line with the Draft National Policy on Children. The Plan of Action would also inform the work on CSEC for Samoa in the next five years in line with the findings of the situation analysis on CSEC. In April 2007, the situation analysis research had begun.

Challenges included commitment of partners and stakeholders, limited understanding of CSEC, getting CSEC onto the Government's list of priorities, and limited information for evidence-based advocacy, as well as the territorialism of organizations which limits the sharing of information with other partners.

Current plans included: to complete the situation analysis on CSEC and CSA, disseminate the findings, and incorporate them into the draft National Policy on Children and the Country Programme Action Plan for Child Protection/National Plan of Action for Children, as well as to obtain Government endorsement of the National Policy on Children and the National Plan of Action. Other plans were to facilitate the amendments and changes to the policy and legal framework in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child legislative compliance review for Samoa, to lobby for child protection to be reflected in the Government's list of priorities and thus in the National Development Strategy, and to continue to link the work on child protection, CSEC and CSA, to other national development initiatives.

*Solomon Islands*

Members of the Solomon Island delegation were: Mr. Aaron Rubi, Director of Social Welfare, Social Welfare Division, Ministry of Health and Medical Services; Ms. Moddie Nanau, Senior Programs Officer, Solomon Islands Broadcasting Corporation (and Chairperson of the Board, Vois Blong Mere Solomon Islands and Member of the Solomon Islands National Advisory Committee on Children), Honiara; Sister Doreen Awaiasi, Centre Coordinator, Christian Care Centre; Ms. Florence Taro, Police Officer, Sexual Assault Unit, Police Headquarters; and Ms. Lovelyn Kwaoga, Center Counsellor, Family Support Center.

Sister Awaiasi was a researcher for the first situation analysis in Solomon Islands. She also followed up with a study on the effect of the logging industry on the incidence of CSEC and CSA in a particular area of Makira Province. Her study covered 12 villages in the logging area of that province.

Sister Awaiasi had conducted group discussions and interviews with individuals and community leaders. The researchers had used puppets to ease the situation, which proved very effective in getting people to talk about CSEC and CSA. Sixty stories of abuse were collected, involving a total of 73 children, 36 of whom were involved in child prostitution. The children were aged from 11 to 19, most falling between 13 and 15 years old. Most of the perpetrators were foreign loggers. Twelve stories involved early marriage or being "sold" into marriage by parents. Other abuse involved pornography (seven cases) and pimping (eight cases). There were stories of nine under-age pregnancies. She also commented on the trusting nature of Solomon Islanders, which made it possible for some foreigners to take a child for a "holiday" and pay the family, who would think nothing of it.

Sister Awaiasi reported that she was challenged many times in the community and elsewhere for talking about CSEC and asked what she, a nun, was doing working on those issues. With more information and awareness raising, her group was trying to inform communities of what could be exploitative and unsafe situations for their children. The Sisters of the Church of Melanesia ran community awareness sessions.

A major finding of the study was that there was little understanding and awareness of the terminology of CSA and CSEC. The sensitive nature of CSEC and CSA contributes to the low levels of awareness of those offences and made it difficult for even experienced researchers to gather data. The study found that some infringements of children's rights that did constitute CSEC and CSA were sometimes ignored by communities or resolved in traditional ways. When children between 1 and 10 years old were involved, matters were usually settled in the traditional way by presenting money to the child's parents.

Between 2005 and 2007, 1,240 cases of sexual offences were reported in Solomon Islands. While the Solomon Islands Police Force has kept records of sexual abuse cases since 2005, only recently had they included the age of the victim. The cases reported included rape, indecent assault, insulting the modesty of a woman, defilement,

gross indecency, obscene exposure, incest, masturbation and gross indecency between two persons of the same sex. That category of crime had always had the lowest number of cases because victims felt too ashamed and frightened to make reports.

There was work being carried out towards the development of a national plan of action in Solomon Islands, which was being steered by a Task Force Committee against CSEC, whose members included representatives of the Social Welfare Division of the Ministry of Health and Medical Services, the Sexual Assault Unit of the Royal Solomon Islands Police, the Christian Care Centre, Save the Children, the Ministry of Women, Youth and Children's Affairs and UNICEF.

*Vanuatu*

Members of the Vanuatu delegation were: Ms. Agatha Malsungai, Legal Officer, Vanuatu Women's Crisis Centre; Ms. Flora Bani-Kalsaria, Chairperson, National Children's Committee, Department of Economic and Social Development; and Ms. Leias Victoria Kaltovei, Child Rights Project Officer, Save the Children Australia, Vanuatu Office.

A representative from the Vanuatu delegation led the presentation of Vanuatu's report, with contributions from the others. The study established that CSEC was occurring in Vanuatu: child prostitution, sex tourism, arranged marriage and trafficking existed. Other key findings were that CSA was becoming more frequent and that incest was common. The Vanuatu police had a Family Protection Unit which dealt with cases of sex offences and child abuse that were taken to court, and the Women's Crisis Centre provided counseling. Non-governmental organizations and civil society had taken the lead in child protection.

## C. Pacific stakeholders' response to the country reports

In the discussion that followed, it was recognized that CSEC was a new issue for public acknowledgement and it was important to clarify the various forms of CSEC so that those would be understood in Pacific island communities. There was concern that the definition of commercial sexual exploitation of children would need further explanations and awareness raising, especially when it came to the issues of adoption of children and trafficking.

In many Pacific cultures, children were often given to other family members or relatives and informally adopted for various reasons. When foreigners or others offered to take care of a child, parents and family did not view that as potentially putting that child at risk. An example was given of a case where a child was "adopted" by a foreigner who periodically gave money to the family and took the child overseas from time to time. Participants questioned whether that constituted CSEC. In many Pacific societies, various kinds of informal adoption of that sort were the norm; therefore, the definition of CSEC (i.e. if it was commercial, directly or indirectly) would require Pacific islanders to consider whether or not certain cultural practices had or could develop a commercial element that may constitute CSEC.

A Cook Islands participant related how adults traveled from Cook Islands to countries overseas with children who were not theirs, and no questions were asked about the adults' relationship with the children, even when they did not appear to be biologically related. The participant noted the many loopholes that existed, putting children at risk, particularly in Pacific attitudes to moving children overseas.

There was also concern about the difficulty of translating terms such as "commercial sexual exploitation of children" into Pacific languages; one comment was that there was a need to make sure the translations were acceptable to communities. However, the Cook Island participants made an important point from their experience: they said that when they tried to find "comfortable", "acceptable" words to use for CSA or CSEC in their community awareness raising, they were told by people in the communities to be "up-front and out in the open" about those issues, if they really wanted to get the message across.

Another point raised was the fact that in some Pacific island countries, males were not allowed to adopt female children. The reason for that was concern for the child, but it was discriminatory in the sense that there was no equivalent monitoring of the adoption of male children or other forms of exploiting children through adoption,

whether intentional or not. It was acknowledged that the many forms of adoption of children in the Pacific and perceptions of moving children from households and between countries, meant that the informal mode of adoption of children was an issue that needed further clarification in Pacific countries.

The Papua New Guinea participants drew attention to the importance of the economic environment as a factor that can promote CSEC. The vanilla boom in that country had led to an increase in cases of CSEC, as 13 and 14-year-olds were married to rich men, and the participant expressed the view that that was not socially questioned as yet, "since money speaks louder than morality".

## D. Assessing regional trends: Overview of the studies and the Pacific context by leading Pacific regional organizations

Presentations were made by four Pacific regional organizations on the CSEC studies and the implications of the findings of those preliminary studie. Some organizations presented information related to their work on children's rights and protection, and related work with Pacific youth on gender issues and concepts of masculinities. Speakers were: Mr. Vijay Naidu, University of the South Pacific; Ms. Margaret Leniston, Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International, Ms. Sandra Bernklau, Regional Rights Resource Team and Ms. Johanna Eriksson Takyo, UNICEF Pacific.

### *1. Social and Economic Changes in the Pacific and CSEC – Professor Vijay Naidu, University of the South Pacific*

Professor Naidu gave an overview of social and economic changes occurring in the Pacific which had impacts on communities' social relations and values and how those changes were reflected in the occurrence of CSEC. He began by discussing the ways in which Pacific society was formerly based on the notion that it protects those who need assistance. He said while all people needed protection during their early years, from family and from the wider community, thereafter, the degree of one's need for support varied with the stage one was at in one's life cycle. Traditional societal protection systems based on kinship and community had undergone change; they were breaking down, and values and norms were also changing.

Changes that relate to CSEC and CSA included those in the social, economic and political domains. Key social changes included a change in kinship systems, whereby today there were more nuclear families and single parent families than the former times when extended families and wider kinship relations were dominant. Changes in the social status of minorities, various age and gender-based groups, together with new practices in the Pacific which distort traditional ones, (such as using polygamy and bride price, for the buying and selling of women and children, so that that people were now regarded as "property"), were recent developments that had occurred. Now there were different social relations attached to those traditional exchanges. The growth of urban areas had also meant a loss of community and social capital, including the intergenerational supervision of children. Urbanization had also led to a situation where young people were more influenced by their peers than their parents. He also pointed out that growing economic and social inequality had resulted in people who were excluded having a strong sense of alienation.

Change from a subsistence economy to a cash economy had led to huge inequalities being evident in different places—with some sites such as ports, tourist destinations, logging and mining sites attracting more economic activity. Many people now lived in poverty while others had great wealth and could explore the possibilities that new forms of entertainment offer. Cash poverty was easily taken advantage of, as was poverty in terms of education and opportunity. Both could lead to different forms of exploitation.

There had been many cultural changes associated with economic and social change in the Pacific. Where in the past, social relationships were based on reciprocity, today they were based on money. People's sense of identity was changing from a communal to an individual focus, so the sense of community and the ability to relate to others in a community or family-oriented way, was diminished. New forms of entertainment, Western life-styles, new information and communications technology and recreational drugs had also had a huge impact on Pacific cultures.

Customs of respect and the culture of silence played their part in contributing to CSEC and CSA incidents; where respected individuals were involved in CSEC and CSA, the culture of silence in Pacific cultures could prevent reporting.

On the political front, the centralization of government and the fact that most decision-making was done by men, meant that women's issues and those of persons in other positions of inequality and powerlessness such as children, were not prioritized. All those changes had affected Pacific societies and cultures and had had a direct impact on children and the emergence of forms of exploitation such as CSA and CSEC.

Professor Naidu noted that there had been a global response to CSEC and CSA evident in terms of the international conventions and agreements. What was needed as well in the Pacific was internal demand to address the issues, and that could come from research, education and advocacy in a range of economic, social, cultural and political areas. He noted that the workshop and sharing of the situation analyses reports provided a good platform from which to begin that work.

### *2. Push factors in youth migration to urban centers and influence of concepts of masculinities – Ms. Margaret Leniston, Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International*

Ms. Leniston described the ongoing community-based research project of her Foundation, "Youth and Mental Health", which involved Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. The findings of their own situation analysis studies on masculinity, mental health and violence had several implications for CSEC. Some of the key findings were: slow economic growth limits economic opportunities for young people, unemployed youth were concentrated in urban areas, and "urban pull" and "rural push" factors result in some young people being pushed out of rural production, leaving isolated communities to go to urban centres for stimulation and schooling. Other findings were that education had failed to equip young people with vocational training, and that crimes of opportunity occurred when immediate want or need overwhelms other considerations; for example, violent robbery was often accompanied by rape and sexual abuse. In addition, the research found that ex-inmates were forming gangs; marijuana and alcohol abuse were associated with violence and opportunistic crimes; crimes of passion against family members, neighbours and associates were often used as an excuse for abuse; violent role-modeling by parents, siblings and teachers was common; and parental abuse was disguised as discipline. The research also confirmed that peer pressure was associated with sexual abuse. She also pointed out that youths had little say in governance or engagement in development.

The study recommendations arising from its work on mental health and concepts of masculinity, included the need to make available a variety of counseling services; improve parenting skills; provide community-based mental health and justice services, more youth education and employment opportunities; give youth more voice in development and align traditional beliefs and practices with human rights and legal protections as expressed in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

### *3. Experience and Lessons Learned in undertaking the Pacific CSEC studies – Ms. Sandra Bernklau, Regional Rights Resource Team*

Ms. Bernklau first explained that the Regional Rights Resource Team had provided technical advice through training of researchers for the CSEC studies that were carried out in Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Samoa and Vanuatu. It had also drafted the regional synthesis overview of the studies which covered Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

Ms. Bernklau then described the CSEC study guidelines, which required interviews with standard questions to be asked to respondents across many sectors. Those included: medical staff, teachers, police, hotel workers, transport operators, bar and nightclub staff, street children, sex workers, fishermen, community members, church members, families, social workers and peer educators. The methods used for the CSEC and CSA situation analysis reports were largely qualitative: focus group discussions and in-depth interviews. The sensitivity of the subject accounted for the fact that much of the evidence was anecdotal. Nevertheless, there was an alarming amount of anecdotal evidence, more than enough to confirm the existence of CSEC and CSA in the Pacific region.

One of the main findings of the five CSEC and CSA studies (Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu) was that CSEC was happening in all five countries. All the respondents participating in the five studies knew or had heard of CSEC and CSA involving someone they knew or themselves. The forms of CSEC indentified included: child prostitution (for cash or in kind), particularly in informal and squatter settlements;

child sex tourism, often facilitated by locals; child pornography; and child trafficking for sexual purposes within and across borders, often taking the form of children being brought to urban areas to work in a relative's home and then coerced into the sex trade.

Ms. Bernklau discussed, and dispelled, some of the common myths about CSEC and CSA. Those include "it's only foreigners", "it's only poor, uneducated kids", "it's only strangers" and "it's only girls and women". She stressed that those abuses illustrate a key gender issue in CSA and CSEC occurrences: they reflect in most cases the common condition of the lack of power and the low status of women and children, as evidenced by the many instances of their commodification through CSEC (i.e. women and children seen as commodities that can be sold or used commercially). It was clear from the Pacific studies that the main victims were girls, boys and women, while the main perpetrators were men, with some instances of women assisting them. The perpetrators were people in positions of power or authority, and included politicians, priests and police, who she referred to collectively as "the three Ps".

Ms. Bernklau went on to describe the "push" and "pull" factors in the region. Push factors include poverty, lack of protection, broken families, migration and urbanization. Pull factors include consumerism, peer pressure (found to be very strong) and the need for income.

The studies highlighted the link between CSEC and migrant seafaring labour, conflict and armed forces, logging and tourism. Ms. Bernklau urged that future plans be cross-sectoral so that all Government ministries, the armed forces, and also industries would be involved. She reminded the workshop participants that human right issues were involved and that the Convention on the Rights of the Child could be used in court, even if a country's laws had not been changed to protect children.

### *4. The Child Protection Programme – Ms. Johanna Eriksson Takyo, UNICEF Pacific*

Ms. Eriksson Takyo prefaced her presentation by explaining that, in the past, UNICEF had addressed symptoms of problems of child abuse by providing assistance to victims. Now, however, it was addressing root causes using a holistic approach, as seen in the Child Protection Programme.

Building a protective environment for children required attention to many elements. One was commitment of Governments, which did not recognize that there was a problem of child abuse and were not allocating funds to provide basic social services to protect children and help the vulnerable. There was an urgent need to persuade Governments that investing in children was good for the country. Another need was for an adequate legislative framework, one that addressed a broad number of child protection violations. Legislative protection and consistent implementation, accountability and redress mechanisms were key in building a protective environment for children. The judiciary and police must be capable of enforcement of child protection measures committed to by Governments. Also needed was the removal of traditional sanctions when violent and abusive practices were involved. She stressed that cultures were not static; they could be changed. Open discussions and the participation of children were also important, as was media reporting and civil society engagement. Those elements could work together to break the culture of silence and protect children. Building children's life skills and knowledge could reduce their vulnerability and risk. Children needed to be equipped so that they would make healthy choices, understand their rights and know where to get protection services. The police must be able to provide protection.

Ms. Eriksson Takyo said that the family support was another key element. Children had the right to grow up in their family, but families needed to be equipped with skills, resources and confidence so that their children thrive. In the area of essential services and rehabilitation, social workers, health workers teachers, police and so forth needed to be equipped with the motivation, skills and authority to identify and respond to child protection abuses. In addition, community awareness could often lead to more reporting of cases. She went on to say that monitoring and reporting was important as it was a means of recording the incidence and nature of abuses and enabled informed and strategic responses. Birth registration was also important as it helped in planning basic social services. Ms. Eriksson Takyo made a final point: money spent on helping victims of CSA and CSEC would be much better spent on prevention.

# III RESPONDING TO COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN: NATIONAL PLANS OF ACTION

## A. Role and purpose of a national plan of action

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya (ECPAT International) prepared the participants for their work the next day on developing national plans of action, by giving a conceptual overview. She explained that a national plan of action was needed in order to serve as a national framework for action against CSEC, to facilitate the formation of a network and engender collaboration and to serve as a guide for monitoring. In addition, a national plan of action would help coordinate actions against CSEC by States, all sectors of society, and national, regional and international organizations, as well as contribute to building a protective environment to increase protection of children from such abuse. She stressed that developing a national plan of action was a process, in which all stakeholders must have input, including children and youth. It could be developed to combat CSEC and CSA specifically, as was the case in the New Zealand and Australian plans. A national plan of action would give a specific framework to develop interventions to address the issues. CSEC could also be included in other plans concerning children, as was the case in Cambodia. However, the risk of doing so was that the issues may be diluted unless a specific CSEC programme was developed under a wider national plan of action.

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya mentioned how some existing national plans of action could be improved with, for example, more detail about how planned activities were going to be resourced, the addition of time frames, and the inclusion of specific actions to combat child pornography. In terms of practical advice, she presented the Methodological Guide used by ECPAT, which covered preparation and implementation of national plans. She stressed that the order of steps in developing a national plan of action was a guide only; it could be adapted to suit the country for which it was intended. Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya's additional comments were shown in brackets. The Guide outlines nine steps that fall under three phases:

*Phase I: Create a favourable environment*

Step 1: Create a network against CSEC
Step 2: Situation analysis of CSEC (that could be used as a tool for advocacy and to raise awareness)
Step 3: Construct a national vision
Step 4: Design national policies to combat CSEC

*Phase II: Design and develop a national plan*

Step 5: Analyze and prioritize problems (for example, a reduction in domestic violence)
Step 6: Establish programmes and projects (that required funding, expertise and agency support)
Step 7: Allocate and manage resources

*Phase III: Implement the national plan*

Step 8: Implement programmes and projects (e.g. ECPAT has a code of conduct that it uses in tourism. Staff are trained and procedures for reporting and monitoring are developed.)

Step 9: Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring:

- Understand the scope of the problem before measures are taken
- Identify relevant indicators (That was extremely important. An example of an indicator was the number of hotels that had adopted the code of conduct.)
- Develop simple information collection systems

Evaluation: (one could hire outside evaluators)

- Efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability
- Three stages:
  - Pre-project assessment
  - Mid course evaluation
  - Post evaluation
- How?
  - Interviews with key informants
  - Focus groups
  - Relevant data analysis

## B. Experience of national plan development in Papua New Guinea

Papua New Guinea was the first Pacific country to follow up on its situation analysis report with a national meeting to discuss CSEC and consider a national response and the only country represented at the workshop to have developed a national plan. Ms. Ume Wainetti, Programme Coordinator of the Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee, Consultative Implementation Monitoring Council, was invited to share the experience of that country of developing a national plan of action, and to share on any pitfalls or lessons learned.

The plan was developed by People against Child Exploitation in Papua New Guinea, but it was not accepted by the Department for Community Development, Office for Child Welfare of the Government of Papua New Guinea on the grounds that the document had to also be reviewed by representatives of Government Welfare Offices throughout the country, despite having had two rounds of extensive consultation with many stakeholders (Government and non-governmental) and a separate consultation with donor agencies to gauge their views.

As the Chairperson for People against Child Exploitation Papua New Guinea, Ms. Wainetti had requested that an adviser from Child Wise Australia be brought in to try to resolve the deadlock between her organization and the Government. Many more consultations were held and compromises were reached, resulting in better coordination and more cordial relations. The draft of a revised national plan of action was ready to be presented for comment and endorsement by the departmental heads of the Government agencies to be directly involved in the implementation of the CSEC national plan of action. Following that briefing, the Secretary for the Department for Community Development would present the plan to the Central Agency Coordinating Committee for approval before it could be submitted to the National Executive Council for final Government approval.

## C. Developing national plans of action

The second part of the workshop was devoted to the process of developing national plans of action. Those sessions were conducted by Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya and Mr. Shafer of ECPAT International. The first session was a group activity facilitated by Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya to introduce the process, followed by working groups and feedback on presentations.

The first activity was to respond to a hypothetical situation in a fictional Pacific country. The five groups of participants were each composed of people from different countries, including a male participant, so that the different experiences and obstacles encountered to the general problem of CSEC could be shared rather than focusing on country-specific situations at first. The task for each group was to develop one element of a national plan of action for *Pacifica*, an imaginary country. The groups were given a scenario of *Pacifica*, with guiding questions and a national plan of action matrix (see appendix 2). The matrix included: Programme, Objectives, Project/Activities, Target groups, Actors, Indicators of achievement, Geographic location, Resources and Time frame, but the last three were omitted by most of the groups due to insufficient time.

The elements of the national plan of action that had to be considered were: prevention (Group 1), protection (Group 2), recovery and integration (Group 3), child and youth participation (Group 4) and coordination and cooperation (Group 5). The point of the exercise was to give participants an example of what was involved in

drawing up a national plan. The fact that the groups consisted of people from different countries, all speaking different languages, reflected a real situation in which stakeholders had different agendas. The groups wrote their ideas on newsprint which were posted around the room. Those ideas are given below.

## D. Draft national plans of action: Group activity reports

While those were the unedited reports from the work groups, they showed the kind of details that came into planning responses on CSEC. [Note: The suggestions and actions, including those responsible for implementation, are in draft form only and do not represent commitments made at the workshop].

| **Prevention (Group 1)** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Programme** | **Objectives** | **Project/Activities** | **Target groups** | **Actors** | **Indicators of achievement** |
| Review of legislation on child protection in view of the Convention on the Rights of the Child | Protect children within the country | Lobby for law reform and tougher penalties for perpetrators; train with the judiciary | Children; parents; communities; judiciary; law enforcement agencies | Relevant NGOs and government. agencies | More children are being protected by the law; severe penalties are being given to perpetrators |
| Training and capacity building for professionals in the education field | Improve the education curriculum to suit the needs of the community; improve service delivery from teachers to students | Address the issue at the National Children's Council; hold focus group consultations with communities and key stakeholders | Children; teachers; parents; community | National Children's Council; Government; ministries; NGOs; parents; teachers | Less moving of families to urban areas for education |
| Awareness-raising at all levels and with all sectors | Improve and increase awareness on services available in the community; increase awareness on CSEC and CSA issues | Identify key people within the community to train as advocates for CSEC and CSA and also on services available within communities, e.g. church ministers, chiefs; multimedia advocacy | Children; parents; community leaders; hoteliers | Relevant NGOs, government agencies | More people in the community are aware of CSEC and CSA; increased reporting of CSA and CSEC |
| Community-based poverty alleviation programmes | Create self reliance; reduce the shift from rural to urban | Income-generating activities; small business training | Children; parents; Families; communities | Relevant government. agencies and NGOs | Less urban drift for employment |
| Review of legislation on child protection in view of the Convention on the Rights of the Child | Protect children within the country | Lobbying for law reform; tougher penalties for perpetrators; training with the judiciary | Children; parents; communities; judiciary; law enforcement agencies | Relevant NGOs and government. agencies | More children are being protected by the law; severe penalties are being given to perpetrators |

| Prevention (Group 2) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Programme** | **Objectives** | **Project/Activities** | **Target groups** | **Actors** | **Indicators of achievement** |
| Develop CSEC and CSA policy in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; review existing laws and policies dealing with CSEC and CSA; develop an advocacy strategy and capacity-building for actors | Put in place legislation that specifically deals with CSEC and CSA;<br>Create awareness education for Government. and the public on issues related to CSEC and CSA | Review existing legislation, including policies; memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between stakeholders and Government; continuous dialogue among stakeholders (networking) | Government; tourism industry; parents; traditional leaders; private sector; children and youth | National Children's Council; legal profession; relevant government departments; NGOs; church | Signing of MOUs; new legislation in place; people trained; effective National Children's Council; enforcement of legislation |

| Recovery and reintegration (Group 3) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Programme** | **Objectives** | **Project/Activities** | **Target groups** | **Actors** | **Indicators of achievement** |
| Awareness; counselling services (improving, strengthening, direction); professional training using local trainers; referrals (if necessary); victim support (e.g. screens in court) | Raise awareness about target group; documentation; make victims aware of services; educate authorities and stakeholders | TV advertising / information spots; leaflets developed and distributed in English and vernacular; press releases; news features; mobile theatre; monitoring and evaluation format in place | Media, NGOs and other stakeholders; government. departments; community; community-based organizations; youth; children; provincial councils; people with disabilities; parents; teachers; police | Training of trainers in Government and NGOs, e.g. Regional Rights Resource Team, Women's Crisis Centre; mental health professionals; Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International; pastoral, safe home family support centre; social welfare; Ministry of Education | More reporting of cases; seek assistance for information; more people using services; certification process (standards are set, ethics, code of conduct, e.g. police); policy, legislative framework, e.g. "no drop" policy |

| Child and youth participation (Group 4) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Programme** | **Objectives** | **Project/Activities** | **Target groups** | **Actors** | **Indicators of achievement** |
| Education and awareness; youth and children participation in national advisory committees; sustainable livelihood | Build self-esteem and self-worth; know one's place in one's society, community, family; improve competencies and life skills to recognize and reduce risks; build advocacy, communication and leadership skills; develop partnerships and opportunities for income-earning and productive skills. | Curriculum development; teacher training; parental awareness; community school board awareness; children's awareness; media and communication; skills training with youth; cultural aspects of CSEC awareness; children's rights; gender and power relations; youth parliament on CSEC and CSA; vocational technical training | Education department; children, youth groups; faith-based groups; women; parents; Families; police; justice; politicians; youth leaders; NGOs; community-based organizations (CBO); Businesses; labour (policies) | Policy and curriculum personnel; peer educators; police; justice; health NGOs; women's groups; youth reps; business owners; companies; civil society organizations | Curriculum has been resourced and implemented at all levels; active peer educators in schools and communities; policies in place; advocate for relevant legislation; compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; more youth-owned businesses; liaison officers in schools |

| **Programme** | **Objectives** | **Project/Activities** | **Target groups** | **Actors** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strengthen the existing national plan of action | Provide better coordination between the existing bodies, authorities, government. Ministries and NGOs dealing with CSEC (including tourist industry), community based organizations, youth, educational system | Better collaboration between the National Children's Council and the relevant ministries and existing authorities that deal with CSEC to create a relevant CSEC policy; effective and efficient awareness of CSEC and CSA; enforce existing MOUs between police and ministries; conduct effective media awareness programmes, e.g. inter-agency protocol between police, social welfare ministry and ministry of health | Primary and secondary school children; teachers; youth; parents; guardians; elders; judiciary; discipline services (police, navy, security officers); sportspeople; women | Government ministries; NGOs; youth; church and faith-based organizations; private sector; tourism workers; community at large, e.g. disability, uniform organizations; community structure; indicators: monitoring and evaluation, positive feedback, successful case studies, situation analysis, data collection |

When all the group reports had been put up around the room, Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya invited the participants to go "market shopping" and review each other's work to pick up good ideas and strategies, as much could be learned from that kind of interactive sharing. A feedback session was held from which the following points emerged.

***Participants' comments***

Reporting back was done in plenary so all groups could hear suggestions on the draft plans. Participants' comments included the following:

- Offenders should have been included in the list of target groups in the reintegration and recovery element
- Faith-based organizations and chiefs needed to be included in the list of actors;
- Objectives needed to be specific and simple, measurable, achievable, resource-based, and time-bound (which could be remembered by the acronym SMART) rather than broad;
- Project activities needed to be linked to objectives;
- Indicators must reflect back to the programme and needed to be accomplishable and specific. For example, rather than "less moving of families to the urban areas for education" (prevention) it could read "10 per cent less moving of families ...", which was measurable.

Other comments were made about structures. Where there were mechanisms already in place for protection of children, as in the fictitious place called *Pacifica*, what was needed was to extend those to include a specific plan to address CSA and CSEC and to ensure implementation and enforcement of those actions. In addition, a comment was made that strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats analysis, such as the one done by the Protection work group as a basis for their plan, could be useful.

Summing up the activity, Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya stressed the need to see the national plan of action development process as a holistic one. Key members of each stakeholder group may form a distinct group and would first need to meet together to decide on the main aim of the national plan of action. Then they could split into smaller groups, one for each of the five elements. That would help create opportunities to involve more stakeholders in their relevant areas, including the private sector. Those groups would need to consult all the other groups during the process to ensure the cohesiveness of the final plan. Key concepts were that content and process go together, and that there was a need for partnership and cohesiveness, allocation of job agencies, and opening the door for children to have their say.

Ms. Griffen added that it was important to include other relevant Government ministries, such as those responsible for labour, education, forestry, fisheries and agriculture, which were some of the sectors relevant to CSEC, if there was to be multi-sectoral responses to the causes – not just incidents – of CSEC. It was important to see how those ministries could contribute to and implement any CSEC plan. Further, she reminded the workshop that Pacific Governments had made commitments to international and regional resolutions on ending CSEC and should monitor and enforce the child protection principles to which they had committed themselves. That included monitoring the private sector and setting standards for companies coming into their countries to ensure that non-state actors comply with government obligations under international law, such as under the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

## E. Analysis of key interventions

The session was facilitated by Mr. Tom Shafer of ECPAT. It focused on one aspect or "pillar" of a national plan of action, that of recovery and reintegration. Recovery began from the time the victim reported or was rescued from the abuse, and successful reintegration was complete when the victim returned to the community and attained the highest quality of life possible within the environment. He gave several examples of what needed to be done in order to achieve the overall objective of enabling children who had experienced CSEC to recover and reintegrate. They included providing psycho-social counseling, rehabilitation and support services for rescued child victims and their families; ensuring medical personnel were skilled in physical evaluation and interviewing victims; establishing alternative education opportunities and eventual re-integration into the classroom; training police officers in sensitive, confidential and supportive management of victims; fostering strong coordination and

collaboration between government ministries, NGOs and other agencies; training social workers and social welfare services staff to assess home conditions, determine alternative placements and supervise guardians; and offering human immunodeficiency virus or acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (HIV and AIDS) testing with pre and post counseling services to all victims.

Additionally, providing abuse awareness and prevention education to children between the ages of five and eight years was necessary, as was developing and institutionalizing a peer support group to encourage children's participation in their recovery and reintegration.

For each example, Mr. Shafer mentioned the specific relevant activities, the agencies responsible and indicators of achievement. He went on to say that there was little known about which recovery and reintegration activities worked well and which did not. While there were indications that some victims fall back into commercial sexual exploitation or become abusers themselves, little research had been done in that area. The questions to ask were, for example: What happens to the victims immediately after the abuse, and the following year, and five years later? How does an organization or stakeholder deal with recovery and reintegration with few resources and little by way of government support? Although not everything could be done, what was the minimum that could be done?

***Country situations: Group activity***

The participants were asked to return to their country groups and work on the recovery and reintegration component of a national plan of action for their country. Mr. Shafer gave out two case studies (see below) with accompanying questions to guide the group's work. Each group was asked to choose one case study and respond to the questions. He then reminded the participants to make their objectives and activities specific and their indicators simple, measurable, achievable, resource-based and time-bound. A feedback session followed.

## Case studies for Fiji Regional Meeting
## Recovery and Rehabilitation

**Case 1**

In one area of an island nation a girl, age 13, was taken from her aunt with whom she had been living after her mother and father became ill and were unable to care for her. She was locked in a house and exploited by more than 10 men per day. After a successful police investigation, the house was raided and the owners arrested. The girl was interviewed by police, who insisted on knowing everything, including specific details of what she was made to do with the men. After the interview of three hours she was taken home to her aunt, who was told to take better care of the girl. The aunt told the girl to forget about the incident and to return to school. However the girl is not sleeping properly, has no appetite, and stays in her room crying – sometimes for two or three days at a time. She is ashamed to return to school. She says there is "no one else like me in the world". A local newspaper has heard about the case and wants to interview the child.

*Question to consider:*

What are the major issues and priorities in cases such as those? What would be the most important priorities for immediate recovery of the girl? How would they be addressed in a CSEC Recovery and Reintegration Country Plan? What would you want to specifically include regarding:

- Police procedures
- Bringing the child back to her home
- Proper and timely identification of a responsible person, i.e. social worker, counsellor, case worker, etc., to assume responsibility for initial recovery and long term reintegration needs? What training would be required?
- What kind of counselling might be required, and how would a national plan of action ensure that counselling was in place and professionally provided?
- What about the return of the child to her aunt? What concerns would you have, how would they be addressed, and what would be the plan if it was best for the child not to live with the aunt until further evaluation could be made?

*(Continued on next page)*

*(Continued)*

- Educational services—what might you put into place to ensure the girl resumed school as soon as possible?
- In regard to the child feeling as if no one else would understand her experience, how might that be addressed?
- If the child reported a physical injury related to the sexual abuse and needs to seek medical care, can it be assured that the care will be confidential, highly sensitive to girls' needs, and safely completed?
- One year later your agency receives a request from a local elementary school asking for advice about preventing sexual exploitation and abuse. What would your response be? What would such a prevention program look like?

**Case 2**

- A young girl has been discovered by the police living on the streets. They bring her to your agency for help. It becomes clear that the girl is probably addicted to heroin and sleeps with men in order to get enough money to buy the drugs. She does not want help. She does not want to stop the drug. She says she "doesn't mind" that she has sex with men. She says that even though she is young she knows what she is doing, knows that it's dangerous, knows all about HIV and AIDS and wants people to leave her alone.

*Questions to Consider:*

a. How would you begin to approach the many issues illustrated by this case? What are the major issues?
b. What are the many types of services that may need to be provided to this girl? Who would coordinate the services? What different agencies would be involved? What would be included in an initial assessment?
c. What kind of policy or procedure would be best in regard to the possibility of HIV and AIDS?
d. What kind of counselling would be the "ideal" for this girl? What professional provides this counselling?
e. Who will be responsible for assuming responsibility for this case? What kind of assessments may be indicated?

## F. Recovery and reintegration reports

For that exercise, participants presented their reports in their country groupings to allow them to have a detailed discussion of how they would respond to the issues of recovery and reintegration in their specific country situations. That enabled the government and non-government representatives to work together on a planned response to CSEC. Case 1 or Case 2 described above, were the hypothetical situations presented by the trainer that the groups could choose to analyze.

***Cook Islands (Case 1)***

| Stakeholders | Objectives | Activities |
|---|---|---|
| Police | Protect life | Receives, processes, prosecutes, follows up |
| Health | Better, healthier lifestyle | Receives, examines, assesses, reports |
| Counselors, social workers | Educate, empower, liberate | Receives, identifies assessment, recommends referral, follows up |
| Caregivers (churches) | Safety, homes, placement | Safe home Support (ongoing) |
| Judiciary (JCPC Children's court) | Court order (temporary) | Files complaint Convenes a family group consultation Follows up |
| Education | Educate | Awareness training<br>Child rights (CSEC and CSA)<br>Sexually transmitted infections, HIV and AIDS, etc. |
| Government | Law enforcement | Feedback workshop on CSA and CSEC |

Currently in Cook Islands, sometimes a safe home was found in New Zealand, and the child was given a choice of whether to go there or stay on in Cook Islands. If s/he went to New Zealand, then a letter of support was given and after that there was e-mail contact. That was all done on an informal basis, but the Cook Islands participants promised they would formalize the procedure on their return.

***Fiji (Case 2)***

Responding to the question, "What are the major issues?" the group identified drug addiction, prostitution, street children and HIV and AIDS. Responding to the question, "What services need to be provided?" the group agreed that the services the girl needed were rehabilitation, full medical examination and psychiatric evaluation, and psychosocial care.

As to the question, "What agencies would be involved?" they said that the police, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Women and Social Welfare would be involved. An initial report of the incident would include a medical report, a psychosocial assessment and an emergency care order. The Fiji Women's Crisis Centre was available to respond to immediate concerns, offering free counseling and support to victims and working closely with the Ministry of Social Welfare and the Director of Public Prosecutions. It offered guidance with regard to court procedures and the language used in court; for example, victims must expect to hear and use words for body parts.

Responding to the question, "What policy or procedure would be best regarding HIV and AIDS?", they stated that there was no policy in place regarding HIV and AIDS, but work on one was progressing.

As to what kind of counseling would be "ideal" for the girl, the group recommended psycho-social and clinical counseling. The Ministry of Women and Social Welfare would assume responsibility and they would need a medical report and a psychiatric assessment.

Responding to the question, "If the police become involved, what should they do?" they explained that the police should follow police protocol to locate the parents and the girl's "clients" and drug dealers. Inter-agency protocols needed to be reviewed and strengthened. They also explained that there was a memorandum of understanding for the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social Welfare, the Ministry of Education and the Police, but that it needed to be strengthened.

***Kiribati (Case 1)***

The main objective was to focus on recovery of the abused child. The first priority was to find a safe place for her. The girl's privacy must be respected and she must be empowered to rejoin society and carry on schooling. In order to accomplish that, activities to be undertaken included establishing a child protection scheme, training specialized counselors and arranging for them to work in schools, setting up protocols for lawyers, making arrangements for the child to make a statement so that she would not have to go to court, ensuring that the girl was not victimized further in court or by the media, and following up on the case while the investigation was ongoing. The people responsible for the case would be the police, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social Welfare, counselors, advocates, lawyers, teachers, church leaders and family members.

Key indicators would be the provision of a safe place, establishment of the child protection scheme, having 28 trained counselors in schools by 2009, 90 per cent successful case management, and the child's school reports indicating adequate academic achievement.

***Papua New Guinea (Case 1)***

Major issues included gang rape, the victim's trauma, the girl having been left with her aunt and the aunt's attitude, the girl's self-blame, the lack of a child-friendly attitude on the part of the police and their lack of training to deal with such issues.

Immediate recovery interventions included referral to the Police Victim's Desk, taking the girl to hospital and finding a refuge, after which her education, repatriation and support would need to be arranged.

Counseling would include trauma and psycho-social counseling by trained counselors. Schooling would continue at school or the girl could take her lessons home; a boarding school was another possibility. Counseling would need to be provided at school. For her social reintegration, a therapy group could help as well as being with friends with whom she felt comfortable.

***Samoa (Case 1)***

Priority issues include counseling for the victim, arranging for her support if/when she was returned to her aunt and also in school, and addressing the health implications. Counseling would require training and capacity-building for service providers, dissemination of information on services available, and an inter-agency protocol response system covering referrals, monitoring and follow-up. Currently, there was no formal inter-agency protocol system, but the participants plan to formalize such a system on their return.

Support for the victim would be achieved through community-based advocacy and awareness programmes. Within the family, programmes would be run on positive parenting and how to identify and determine symptoms of CSEC and CSA. Church groups and traditional groups would be involved in providing a supportive environment. In school, teachers would be trained in CSA and CSEC issues and counseling would be carried out. Currently, no school has a counselor. A network between the school and service providers (an inter-agency protocol) would be set up.

A plan of action would also include a review of the legal framework and policies in place for children. The health aspect would require that health professionals be specifically trained to deal with CSEC and CSA and a counseling unit established in the hospital.

***Solomon Islands (Case 1)***

The priorities include the victim's safety and her referral to the Ministry of Health with her consent as well as giving her an explanation of the process. A safe home would be provided in addition to counseling by trained people. After that, the police would be called in. Rehabilitation includes the counseling and a group discussion with family members. That was the usual procedure in Solomon Islands.

A plan of action would have these elements:

*Programme:* to protect the rights and privacy of the victim

*Objectives:* to develop and establish procedures and protocols in dealing with CSEC victims

*Activities:* lobby Government; identify relevant stakeholders; hold consultations; draft policies and procedures

*Target groups:* Government (all MPs), police, legislators, faith-based organizations and NGOs, Ministry of Health

*Indicators:* a two-day conference of all stakeholders held in 2008.

***Vanuatu (Case 1)***

The issues involved were the parents being unable to care for the child due to poor health; the child being locked up and sexually exploited; the way in which the police interviewed the child; the return of the child to her guardian; and the trauma experienced by the child. The first priority was to protect the child from further sexual exploitation. To help the child recover there needed to be counseling, a safe house, prosecution of the abusers, and guardians and protection for the child.

Vanuatu also drew up a plan of action which would have these elements:

*Key area of action:* recovery and rehabilitation

*Objectives:* recovery of victims of CSEC and CSA

*Activities:* establish a child-friendly environment in police stations; train more female police officers to deal with CSEC and CSA victims; enforce a "no drop" policy; review existing police regulations; have ongoing counseling services for children (and parents and guardians if they want) by specially trained counselors

*Actors:* police, legal professionals, courts, correctional services, counselors, community leaders, pastors, teachers and guardians

*Indicators:* a child-friendly environment in police stations; more female police officers; enforcement of a "no drop" policy; the police regulations review completed; counseling services provided

## G. Summing up

Mr. Shafer thanked the participants for their presentations and commented on the fact that they had covered all the essential aspects of the cases. He went on to highlight some of those aspects. Firstly, he stressed the importance of the physical conditions that justify including a medical examination as part of the recovery process. The examination should include tests for pregnancy, sexually transmitted infections, HIV and AIDS, substance abuse (alcohol and drugs) and urinary tract infections. Injuries need to be treated, and weight and nutrition needed to be monitored. An immediate examination was vital in order to obtain forensic evidence for the court case. To prevent the victim from not being traumatized further by such an examination, doctors must have specialized training so that they carry out the examination sensitively and gently.

Mr. Shafer also stressed the importance of returning victims to school. That could be the best psycho-social intervention for them. It could give structure to their lives, give them rules and give them hope.

Peer support groups for victims could also be very effective. In some countries, CSEC and CSA survivors had formed an effective support group. Setting up that kind of group needed careful handling and issues of confidentiality needed to be dealt with.

In some countries in South East Asia, a person from an NGO who has the necessary expertise must accompany the police on every CSEC and CSA case to which they were called out. That person provided support for the victim and act as a kind of advocate. Other effective ways of helping the victim recover and reintegrate included drama therapy, music therapy, vocational education training and telephone counseling.

There were professional organizations (medical, legal, educational) that are willing to become involved in CSEC and CSA issues, and participants needed to make themselves aware of those organizations. In the United States of America, the Crimes against Children Research Center had educational programmes for children between five and eight years old on preventing sexual abuse. The evidence so far suggested that those programmes were useful and effective.

When it came to supporting and strengthening social networks, UNICEF had expertise and offered some possibilities, of which participants could take advantage. Mr. Shafer summed up by saying that safety was paramount; a victim could not be rehabilitated if he or she was still afraid that the perpetrator was still at large.

## H. Participants' comments on draft national plans of action

Each country group was asked to answer the following questions – based on their CSEC study, their own work experience and the workshop sessions on preparing national plans of action.

1) What are some emerging CSEC issues in the country, and what was the degree of awareness about them?

2) What would be needed to address the issues? (Is a national plan of action on CSEC needed? Or was another kind of framework needed? Can CSEC be incorporated into other child rights or child protection plans?)

3) If a national plan of action on CSEC was needed, what are the processes to go about developing one?

4) If a national plan of action was not required, what were the processes of incorporating CSEC into an existing framework or plan?

5) What obstacles were anticipated and what was the response to those obstacles?

In the ensuing discussion, the groups identified emerging CSA and CSEC issues as:

- child prostitution
- pornography (print and electronic)

- early marriage and arranged marriage – in cases where CSEC was involved
- rape
- teenage pregnancy
- child trafficking
- Asian nightclubs using 16-year-old girls
- spiritual abuse

The last two items above were mentioned by Ms. Wainetti (Papua New Guinea). She described how a man calling himself Black Jesus was having sex with young girls in exchange for paying their school fees.

With regard to levels of awareness of the issues in the Pacific region, the participants agreed that there was a lot more awareness of CSA issues than CSEC issues. Regarding what countries could do to address the issues, and whether or not CSEC national plans of action were needed, the questions focused on whether countries would want to respond with a national plan of action on CSEC or to address CSEC within existing national plans of action on children or through existing child protection programmes. The responses varied, with some countries (Cook Islands, Kiribati) saying they needed a national plan of action on CSEC and others saying they planned to incorporate CSEC and CSA issues into other plans.

Ms. Griffen asked the participants to meet in their country groups in the evening so that they could discuss those matters more fully and present their thoughts on the third day.

# IV THE WAY FORWARD

## A. Pacific responses to CSEC: What is needed?

The third and last day of the workshop was devoted to presenting, in country groups, the participants' plans of action (immediate and long-term) to combat CSEC and CSA, the obstacles they foresaw, and how those might be overcome. Those plans were developed from the last session of the second day.

The reporting back session on the third day was designed so that country participants could share their plans on responding to CSEC and CSA. Representatives of regional organizations and other United Nations agencies were also invited to attend and listen to the draft plans and responded later in a session entitled, "Pacific regional responses", which enabled a range of organizations, from United Nations agencies such as UNICEF and ILO, to regional intergovernmental organizations such as the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the University of the South Pacific to international and regional NGOs, to reflect on the CSEC plans and consider relevant linkages or support that could be provided by their organizations. Lastly, a round-table review of the various country strategies was held in which participants were invited to share their concerns and feelings about the plans, their own and those of other countries and provide suggestions across countries.

The reporting back session was facilitated by Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya of ECPAT International and Ms. Griffen of ESCAP. Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya began by saying that, while all agreed that CSEC and CSA were serious issues, the way each country responded to them depended on its situation. In some countries, a national plan of action was needed, while in others, the issues could be incorporated into existing frameworks. The risk of doing the latter, however, was that the CSEC and CSA issues might get lost within that framework, their importance diminished amidst the other issues in the framework. Therefore, it would be important to develop a specific sub-plan on CSEC and CSA, including activities and a monitoring system, to be integrated into broader plans on children in order to ensure adequate attention was given to CSEC and CSA issues.

Before asking the groups to present their future plans, Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya announced that the third World Congress against CSEC would be held in November 2008 in Brazil. The agenda for the Congress was being worked on. She reminded the participants that their countries had been active at the Post Yokohama Mid-Term Review of the East Asia and Pacific Regional Commitment and Action Plan against CSEC, held in Bangkok in 2004, and she anticipated that Pacific countries would be equally active in 2008. She urged participants to meet with their stakeholders and government personnel when they returned to their countries and consider preparations they may want to make for a national report and participation in the next Congress. They could also check the ECPAT website, which would allow them to have some input into the agenda for the Congress and what they would like to see as outcomes.

Ms. Griffen added there was an opportunity for Pacific island countries to consider how they could work regionally and present a Pacific overview on CSEC at the Congress, thereby making a greater impact. With the present CSEC country studies and new ones being completed by Cook Islands, countries could consider networking for Pacific presentations and participation at the next global congress on CSEC.

## B. Country strategies

The workshop then proceeded to the countries' reports in more detail and considerations on:

a) whether countries present would have a CSEC plan of action or work on CSEC within other frameworks and plans of action (e.g. the child protection or national child protection policies)

b) obstacles expected and foresaw and how to respond to them

c) comments on other countries' reports to assist stakeholders' with their planned actions

Ms. Griffen urged participants to listen to the plans of other countries and make helpful suggestions and comments. Participants could also seek clarifications on ideas or strategies that interested them. She explained that a particular feature of the workshop was the investment of resources to make sure that for each country, both government and non-government representatives were invited who could be a core CSEC response team to attend and deliberate on the country responses to CSEC. She reiterated that the regional workshop was a great opportunity for the countries that had undertaken CSEC studies to come together to share ideas, to draft plans and learn from each other.

The country presentations are summarized below.

| **Cook Islands** | |
|---|---|
| **Action** | **Obstacles** |
| * Revive the National Advisory Children's Council and create Children of Tomorrow, an initiative involving community leaders.<br>* Drive forward the development of a national plan of action, using information and skills from the workshop.<br>* Involve the Ministries of Health and Education, the police, the tourism industry and immigration authorities.<br>* The Cook Islands Police want to formulate new legislation which includes CSEC and ensure it is passed within two years. | The tourism industry may be in denial about CSEC.<br>The Government regards social issues as low priority. |

*Comments*

From Ms. Kuiniselani Tago (Samoa) and Ms. Griffen: Governments need hard evidence to convince them of the seriousness of CSEC and CSA, and the first CSEC studies could assist in that way. Also, the regional overview showed that CSEC was not a problem limited to any one country, but existed regionally and globally.

Ms. Pimonsaengsuriya asked government representatives if it was possible to give a particular department the responsibility of advocating attention to CSEC issues in other departments. Ms. Tago confirmed that in Samoa, the Ministry of Women was a very strong advocate of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and has partnerships with other ministries and NGOs; however, that did not extend to strategic levels. She stressed the need for regional organizations to have a more integrated approach.

| **Fiji** | |
|---|---|
| **Activities** | **Obstacles** |
| * Recommend integration of CSEC issues into the child protection action plan that Government was formulating with UNICEF.<br>* A national consultation on CSEC was due to be held on Thursday and Friday of the current week, at which they would discuss such integration. Mrs. Litia Mawi, Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Women, Social Welfare and Housing, was Chair of the National Committee on Children. | Convincing the Ministry of Finance and Planning of the importance of the issue. |

*Comments*

Ms. Griffen said that it was necessary to find out more about the CSEC situation in each country. That could be done through further research and analysis to map the incidence and prescribe actions that need to be taken. She noted from a country representative's comment, that the support and commitment of certain Government ministries could often be one of the main means of carrying forward actions on CSEC and child protection.

| Kiribati | |
|---|---|
| **Activities** | **Obstacles** |
| * They will establish a task force, consult with stakeholders, draft a national plan of action, disseminate the draft, revise it, submit it to Government, and have it endorsed and approved by the end of 2009. Once implementation begins, they will monitor and evaluate. | Funding for the process. People were more interested in building or fixing bridges than combating CSEC and CSA.<br>Cultural barriers.<br>To overcome these obstacles, they will tap into government funds, raise awareness, and lobby planners and government ministers, reminding them of their commitments under the Convention of the Rights of the Child and Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Elimination of Discrimination against Women. |

| Papua New Guinea | |
|---|---|
| **Activities** | **Obstacles** |
| * Re-instate training programmes.<br>* Check implementation of the newly revised Child Welfare Act.<br>* Lobby line ministries.<br>* Lobby the Labour Department to monitor people coming into the country and revise labour laws.<br>* Carry out institutional lobbying, e.g. in the tourism industry, and involve both Government and NGOs in improving the situation. | Convincing certain people in Government (opposition from one person can hinder its work).<br>Ignorance of government personnel. Education could be helpful in that area.<br>The use of culture to conceal guilt of abuse.<br>The sheer size of Papua New Guinea and its population (almost 6 million). Involving the armed forces could help. |

*Comments*

Ms. Wainetti described how in Papua New Guinea attempts had been made to link CSEC to obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, but it was very confusing. The country also had a child protection programme, but the implementation was often "pulled" by the donors because they had their own objectives. Her organization had spent years working on a national plan and even now it had not been finalized, as it was still necessary to "sell" its plan to the Government in order to have the Government take ownership.

The People against Child Exploitation Committee had incorporated its plan into the Family and Sexual Violence Strategy, as that was the only way they could sustain it. That strategy had been the vehicle for taking the CSEC plan around the country. An officer had been appointed an officer who would work specifically on CSEC and would also work with the People against Child Exploitation Committee.

Ms. Wainetti also told the participants that some key government officials were members of relevant NGO committees and that was very useful, for example, when it came to transferring documents between such an NGO and government offices. She further mentioned that Papua New Guinea was incorporating CSEC into existing legislation, such as the Criminal Code and Evidence Act and the Child Welfare Act, in order to make sure that the rights of women and children were protected. Her advice to the workshop, based on the experience of Papua New Guinea, was that the process of developing a national plan of action and getting it endorsed by Government was a long process with many pitfalls along the way, but that it was worth taking the time and doing it properly.

| Samoa |
|---|
| **Activities** |
| * Plan to incorporate CSEC issues into the UNICEF Child Protection Programme and get Government endorsement. The programme would be expanded to include CSEC specifically. That would be done by consulting with stakeholders, communities, partners at regional level and children.<br>* Invite Ministry of Finance and Planning personnel onto CSEC committees.<br>* Complete their situation analysis and disseminate the findings widely.<br>* Facilitate amendment of their legal framework to reflect their CSEC and child protection work.<br>* Disseminate the findings and skills from the workshop among all organizations working on CSEC.<br>* Put a biblical element into their CSEC awareness-raising work. |

| Solomon Islands |
|---|
| Solomon Islands already had a national plan of action in place. What the participants wanted was to see the national plan of action Committee and the National Advisory Council of Children take action on CSEC and organize consultations with all stakeholders on the case studies on CSEC that have been carried out by various NGOs, such as the Christian Care Centre and the Family Support Centres. |

| Vanuatu |
|---|
| **Activities** |
| * Finalize the situation analysis.<br>* Ensure that the scoping study on the new Ministry of Justice includes CSEC issues.<br>* Save the Children in Vanuatu only partially addresses CSEC, so more attention to CSEC was needed as well as more awareness raising. In short, make CSEC issues more visible.<br>* Incorporate a CSEC national plan of action into the existing Plan of Action for Children. The National Children's Committee, through the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Social Welfare, will hold in-country consultations and from these all stakeholders will agree to a matrix for the national plan of action, which will become the framework for CSEC in Vanuatu. Then they will request technical assistance to finalize the plan. |

## C. Regional organizations and responses to commercial sexual exploitation of children

The session was chaired by Ms. Margaret Leniston, Regional Health Programme Manager for the Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International. The session gave the participants a chance to hear from representatives of Pacific governmental and non-governmental organizations in the region about their work and how it could support countries in their responses to CSEC and CSA.

Professor Vijay Naidu of the University of the South Pacific spoke about the work that the university, as the premier regional educational institution, was doing. He stressed the importance of sustainable development in the region and expressed regret that social development, and CSEC and CSA, were neglected issues. The obsession with economic concerns had created problems worldwide and needed to be balanced with social considerations. The School of Law and the Department of Social Work both contributed to child protection and awareness of CSEC and CSA issues. The Department of Social Work had a field education programme that included working with Save the Children Fiji to create awareness about CSEC. Another way that the university could contribute was by carrying out research regionally and locally, as there was a need for hard data on CSEC and CSA issues.

Professor Naidu felt that the work of the University of the South Pacific in that area fell short; it did not deal specifically with CSEC and CSA. He asked UNICEF, ECPAT and other organizations to work with his university as he felt that much could be gained from such collaboration.

Finally, he commented on the variety of ways the countries represented at the workshop were tackling CSEC and CSA. That variety was due to the very different conditions and contexts of the countries. He urged that approaches to combat CSEC and CSA include faith-based organizations, which all teach respect for children and women whether they be Christian, Muslim or Hindu. He also stressed the importance of including all ethnicities in such regional workshops, reminding the meeting of the multi-ethnicity of Fiji, Australia and New Zealand.

Ms. Sandra Bernklau, Project Manager for Pacific Regional Rights Resource Team, described their work in providing technical assistance and training in human rights to Governments and organizations on request. Their community paralegal rights officers currently run training programmes in nine Pacific islands countries. They work at community level and also with NGOs, Governments, the police, social welfare groups and nurses. The human rights training had a strong gender element. It covered all the major conventions and focused on the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Ms. Bernklau felt, however, the Regional Rights Resource Team could improve its work by incorporating CSEC and CSA issues into its training for police officers and involving its paralegals more in those issues.

Mr. Jesse Anderson, the Information Technology Administrative Assistant in the International Labour Organization (ILO) Fiji Office, spoke about two ILO conventions that were of particular interest. Those were the Minimum Age Convention and the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention. The latter Convention covered all forms of slavery, the use of children in the production of pornography, the use of children in the production of drugs, and trafficking.

A National Child Labour Committee had been established in Fiji, which had members from government ministries, faith-based organizations, international agencies such as UNICEF and ESCAP, the media, NGOs, unions, employer organizations and social service organizations. That Committee was active in awareness raising, running workshops and data collection. Recently, a survey on child labour had been carried out in a rural school and a national survey was in the pipeline. Annual activities, such as an essay and art competition, were carried out on the World Day against Child Labour.

Ms. Johanna Eriksson Takyo, Chief of the Child Protection Programme of UNICEF Pacific, first recapped what other speakers said about the good work achieved so far in the countries represented at the workshop and their plans for future action. She urged the participants to make sure that those plans were translated into action when they returned to their countries. Ms. Eriksson Takyo then described the work of UNICEF in 14 Pacific countries. They had five programmes: the Child Protection Programme, the Health, Nutrition, Water and Environmental Sanitation Programme, a new Education Programme (2008), an HIV and AIDS Programme and a new Policy Analysis Programme.

Ms. Eriksson Takyo told the meeting that the catchword of UNICEF was "results for children". That would drive their programme for the next five years and would enable them to say in five years' time, *"This is the impact. This has been achieved."* In order to measure the results and impact of their work, it was necessary to have baseline data, and for that UNICEF proposed to carry out research on child protection, building on existing data and including the CSEC situation analyses.

UNICEF Pacific supported an integrated approach to combating CSEC and CSA. For integration to work there needed to be links. That was where UNICEF could help by engaging with government ministries and other stakeholders. She added that the Child Protection programme could be called an umbrella programme for the four other UNICEF programmes, as they do not operate in isolation.

UNICEF would have increased resources, financial and human, which would enable it to have stronger partnerships and better dialogue with Pacific island countries. In Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Samoa, UNICEF was setting up stronger field offices, each with a national child protection officer. Moreover, the new Policy Analysis Programme would be able to help by costing child abuse, and that would influence budget allocations and national plans of action.

With regard to national advisory committees for children, some of which were reported by participants to be dormant, UNICEF could work with the countries by providing those committees with models and strategies that had worked elsewhere in order to make them more effective. Ms. Eriksson Takyo urged participants to ensure that in their countries, members of those committees were enthusiastic and committed. They were, after all, accountable for implementing national child protection commitments.

Mr. Thomas Shanahan, Research Analyst for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building at the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Pacific Centre, briefly described the work that UNDP did in the region: technical assistance, mainstreaming, institutional and policy development and capacity-building. There were three units at the Centre, one of which was the Crisis Prevention and Recovery Unit, in which Mr. Shanahan worked. He explained that, while the Centre did not specifically work on CSEC or CSA, its projects did involve the issues. One such project was a study on women and girls with disabilities in 22 Pacific island countries. The study would present evidence-based arguments for greater attention to women with disabilities by identifying the challenges they faced, which would probably include issues of sexual abuse and violence, the social and economic factors leading to those challenges and recommendations for regional and national action by all partners.

The second project was in the formulation stage. The UNDP Pacific Centre, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), UNICEF, the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Community had discussed ways to work in partnership with women's organizations and service providers to scale up ongoing initiatives to prevent gender-based violence through working in partnerships with boys and men. The components of the project would include violence against children. They would have a consultative and multi-stakeholder design process with NGOs, service providers, Government, the media, the private sector, United Nations agencies and the Council of Regional Organizations of the Pacific agencies and representatives of the criminal justice sector. The emphasis was on partnership, to avoid duplication.

Ms. Sally Cobb, UNIFEM Programme Coordination Assistant for End Violence against Women, said that CSEC and CSA, as gender-based issues, were part of the work of UNIFEM. She listed some of the programmes: End Violence against Women, HIV andAIDS Governance, Peace and Security and Economic Security of Women.

UNIFEM administered the United Nations Trust Fund in Support of Actions to Eliminate Violence against Women, which in 2007 gave UNIFEM US$ 300,000 to fund projects in the Pacific. UNIFEM helped to develop project implementation and design as well as documentation of projects on violence against women. They ran workshops and worked closely with the Fiji Women's Crisis Centre. Next year, UNIFEM would be involved with the Fiji Women's Crisis Centre regional training programme. Ms. Cobb suggested that participants tell their colleagues that they could apply for sponsorship to UNIFEM to attend the training. UNIFEM hoped to develop a regional trust fund which would enable it to establish more specific criteria than those of the global trust fund.

Mr. Matthew Leslie, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat Regional Security Advisor and head of the law enforcement unit, explained that his office coordinated law enforcement agencies in the Pacific, supporting their activities and providing research. He also worked with organizations such as the Pacific islands Chiefs of Police. Mr. Leslie's role was to highlight strategic and policy issues for leaders in the Pacific. He stressed the importance of participants linking with law enforcement agencies in their countries to make sure data were gathered and shared. In order to identify trends, data was essential.

The Pacific Immigration Directors Conference produced an annual report, which next year would include, for the first time, collection of data on victims of trafficking: their age, gender and the circumstances of their being trafficked. That would enable them to identify the extent of risk, among other things.

The need for legislation was paramount, and the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat had worked on a model bill which addresses the issues of trafficking in persons and the exploitation of children. Cook Islands had started to implement that new legislation, and Vanuatu had used it to fill gaps in its existing legislation. Tuvalu and the Federated States of Micronesia each had a draft of the bill. Tonga and Nauru were doing a gap analysis of their legislation, and Kiribati, Palau and the Republic of Marshall Islands were consulting with the Forum on the bill. It was important to have legislation in place, as one way of reducing CSEC was strengthening the capacity to prosecute. Mr. Leslie stressed the importance of such meetings as the regional; stakeholders' meeting, as they helped to raise the priority level of CSEC and CSA issues.

## D. Round table: Responses to country strategies by representatives of Pacific regional organizations and other United Nations agencies

The session was a chance for all the regional organizations present to comment on the country presentations they had heard, including proposed national actions, and also to make suggestions on their organization's possible role in supporting countries' efforts to combat CSEC and CSA. Participants from the workshop and regional organizations' representatives engaged in a helpful exchange of comments.

A participant from Papua New Guinea asked how Governments could be convinced of the importance of those social welfare issues. Professor Naidu suggested lobbying, using the media and conducting evidence-based research. Mr. Leslie added that it would help if Governments were told how much a policy was likely to cost.

A participant from Fiji asked about the extent to which regional organizations made use of the University of the South Pacific. Ms. Eriksson Takyo replied that UNICEF had initiated discussion with the School of Law (in Vanuatu) about including children's rights in its curriculum and that the same could be done in the Social Work programme. Ms. Bernklau added that the Regional Rights Resource Team worked with the Law School. Mr. Shanahan said that UNDP had established a relationship with the University of the South Pacific and the University of Papua New Guinea.

Also from Fiji, was a comment about donor support and the fact that international agencies had their own agendas. Mr. Leslie suggested that Governments needed to identify a lead agency for a particular issue.

The Cook Islands participants brought up the matter of people being entrenched in cultural ways which hindered their work. An example was the way certain songs that were seen as condoning aspects of CSA and CSEC were broadcast on radio, despite protests from NGOs. Cook Islands also pointed out the challenge of quantifying data on CSA and CSEC.

A participant from Papua New Guinea commented on the fact that while they could teach women and girls who were in prostitution new skills for economic alternatives, there were few markets for the things they made, so they returned to prostitution. It was necessary to find some alternative occupations which would prevent that from happening. In Papua New Guinea, many CSEC victims were girls who resorted to prostitution to pay their school fees. Regarding donor agencies, she said that relationships between agencies and the recipients of aid could be problematic where time frames and project activities were concerned. A Samoan participant responded by insisting that projects became donor-driven only when the recipients allowed that to happen. Ms. Eriksson Takyo said that UNICEF was geared towards providing for the priority needs of Governments. She said that "ownership" of a project was with the Government concerned.

A Solomon Islands participant felt that prostitution could not be eliminated but only reduced, and there was a need to ensure that children were not pushed or lured into prostitution. Fiji suggested that one way to address the demand was to prosecute the "buyers". Fiji raised the issue of dealing with child perpetrators of CSA and CSEC and preventing them from re-offending as there was not a lack of support and help for them.

A Samoan participant recommended drama as a more effective way of raising awareness than teaching and preaching. Drama was inspiring and touched people's hearts. She also made the point that in Samoa, they worked first with the family concerned. When relationships within a family were firm, there was less abuse. Another Samoan participant commented that competition for funds hindered cooperation among government departments. She asked how the process of law reform could be sped up. Ms. Griffen suggested that a regional approach to drafting legislation could help; for example, by countries sharing model legislation.

# V CONCLUSION OF THE WORKSHOP

The closing was chaired by Ms. Sera Vulavou of Kids Link Fiji Alumni, a programme activity of Save the Children Fiji. First she called on Ms. Petueli, who, on behalf of the partners ESCAP, ECPAT and Save the Children Fiji, thanked the representatives from the seven Pacific island countries, the resource people and the facilitators for their contributions and participation in the workshop, and expressed the hope that they had benefited from the regional workshop and enjoyed it. She said that what was now important was that the country representatives return home, disseminate what they had gained from the workshop, consult with their national stakeholders and work towards developing and implementing their plans. Such workshops could encourage more work on CSEC and could be a source of information.

Ms. Griffen thanked the participants of each country group, the facilitators, and representatives of regional organizations, United Nations agencies and interested observers, mentioning the particular contribution each group had made to the workshop. She particularly thanked the Save the Children Fiji organizing team for its arrangements for the meeting. Collectively, a great deal of work had gone into making the Consultation a success. Like Ms. Petueli, she urged everyone to maintain the impetus so that positive outcomes would result.

Mr. Shafer added to that by noting the importance of the workshop and how it related to care and protection of CSEC victims. He emphasized the commitment of ECPAT to combating CSEC in the region and also to supporting the participants' work in their own countries by providing materials and technical assistance on drafting plans of action. He reminded the group that many children were counting on adults to protect them from abuse, and it should not let them down.

The Fiji Director for Social Welfare, Ms. Ilisapeci Rokotuidau, expressed her thanks, saying that she appreciated being able to attend the workshop and had benefited a lot from the experience.

The male participants from Kiribati thanked the organizers for making sure that men were involved in the response to CSA and CSEC. Other members of the country groups also expressed their thanks for being invited to participate. They all agreed that it had been a very worthwhile workshop and were full of determination to put into practice the skills they had learnt and to pass on their knowledge to others, so that ultimately, children in their countries would benefit and live safely in their communities.

Finally, Ms. Vulavou thanked the organizers for giving her the opportunity to chair the final session. She stressed the importance of all the interested groups present at the workshop working together in order to make progress in their response to CSEC and CSA, and also emphasized the importance of including children and young people in their planning of interventions. Ms. Vulavou called on Sister Awaiasi to say a prayer and bring the three-day Consultation and planning workshop to a close.

Ms. Petueli and Ms. Low presented each participant with a copy of the group photograph that was taken on the second day and a CD of all the conference photos and wished them a safe journey home.

# Appendix I: Provisional programme

United Nations
ESCAP

ecpat

Save the Children
Fiji

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY
19 November 2007

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC
END CHILD PROSTITUTION, CHILD PORNOGRAPHY AND TRAFFICKING OF CHILDREN FOR SEXUAL PURPOSES
SAVE THE CHILDREN FIJI

**Regional Stakeholders' Consultation and Planning Workshop on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Sexual Abuse in the Pacific**

19-21 November 2007
Suva

**PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME**

**Monday, 19 November 2007**

0900-1030 **Regional stakeholders' meeting on CSEC studies**

- Opening statements by partner organizations
- Introduction by participants
- Purpose of the meeting – ESCAP

1030-1045 **Break**

1045-1230 **Pacific CSEC studies:**

- Common understanding on CSEC (15 min.), ECPAT
- Regional overview of studies – *Progress report since 2003 meeting* (15 min.)
- Participants report on country studies (10 min. each)
  - Cook Islands
  - Fiji
  - Kiribati
  - Samoa

1230-1330 Lunch break

1330-1415 **Pacific CSEC studies (cont'd):** (10 min. each)

- Papua New Guinea
- Solomon Islands
- Vanuatu

Question and Answer

1415-1530 **Regional overview of CSEC studies – Pacific context**

- Social and economic change – comments by Pacific regional organizations – Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International, University of the South Pacific
- Gender issues – comments by ESCAP, UNIFEM, Regional Rights Resource Team
- Rights issues – comments by Regional Rights Resource Team
- Child protection framework – UNICEF

1530-1545 Break

1545-1700 **Understanding national plans of action** by ECPAT and country representatives

- Role and purpose of national plans of action on CSEC
- Sharing experience of national plan of action development from the region: Fiji and Papua New Guinea

1700 **Wrap-up of the day**

**Tuesday, 20 November 2007**

0900-0910 **Recap of DAY ONE**

0910-1000 **Holistic approaches to addressing commercial sexual exploitation** by ECPAT

Group work on developing a national plan of action/country strategy on for country X. A scenario of country X with guiding questions and matrix will be given to each group to use for the discussion to develop the national; plan of action/country strategy under the following elements:

- Prevention
- Protection
- Recovery and reintegration
- Child and youth participation
- Coordination and cooperation

1000-1030 **Holistic approaches to addressing commercial sexual exploitation of children (cont'd):** Plenary feedback presentation of the group discussions (10 min. each) by ECPAT

- Prevention
- Protection

Question and Answer

1030-1045 Break

1045-1200 **Holistic approaches to addressing commercial sexual exploitation (cont'd):** Plenary feedback presentation of the group discussions (10 min. each) by ECPAT

- Recovery and reintegration
- Child and youth participation
- Coordination and cooperation

Question and Answer

Wrap-up on linkages of each component

1200-1300 Lunch

1300-1400 **Analysis on key interventions** by ECPAT

Group work to look into a detailed, in-depth conceptual analysis of one key area or element of the national plan of action/country strategy plan on CSEC, as an example

1400-1530 **Analysis on key interventions (cont'd)** by ECPAT

- Plenary feedback presentation of the group discussions (10 min. each)
- Key issues to consider on care and protection

1530-1545 Break

1545-1700 **The ways forward** by ECPAT

Country group work to review the progress made and identify what more needs to be done

1700 **Wrap-up for the day**

**Wednesday, 21 November 2007**

0900-0910 **Recap of DAY TWO**

0910-1045 **The ways forward (cont'd)** by ECPAT

*Invitation to other regional organizations and United Nations agencies to attend*

- Plenary feedback presentation from the group discussions
- Wrap-up: the ways forward in addressing commercial sexual exploitation of children

1045-1100 Break

1100-1230 **Pacific regional responses**

Pacific regional organizations and other agencies – Discussion and information sharing with participating organizations, such as Forum Secretariat, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, University of the South Pacific, Foundation of the peoples of the South Pacific International and United Nations agencies

1230-1330 Lunch

1330-1500 **Round-table review of country strategies – plenary**

- Discussion of obstacles and sources of assistance
- Recommendations for ways forward

1500-1545 Break

1545-1630 **Closing**

Remarks by participants

Closing statements by partner organizations

# Appendix II: Case study prepared by ECPAT for planning exercise on commercial sexual exploitation of children and child sexual abuse

**CASE STUDY**
**An Imaginary Island in the Pacific Ocean: "Pacifica"**

## Background of "Pacifica"

Pacifica is a small island with a long coast line on the Pacific Ocean. It is rich in natural resources, but land degradation and water pollution are already evident. In recent years, Pacifica has successfully marketed itself in the world market as a popular tourist destination for local and foreign tourists, which has helped boost the overall economic development of the country. Although the country benefits from the income brought in by exports of its natural resources and the growing tourism industry, there continues to be a big gap between the rich and poor.

## Impacts on Children and Families

Poverty and widening gaps in wealth resulting from socio-economic shifts in the country are having marked effect. Men, sometimes with their wives, are obliged to leave their homes in search of employment in order to provide the basic necessities, including education for their children. However, the current education system does not often provide children with the necessary knowledge and skills to benefit from the booming economy and attain gainful employment. A common practice is for children to be sent to live with their extended families in cities, to enhance their educational, vocational and economic opportunities. However, a recent study revealed that some of those children are sexually abused by family, household or community members, neighbours, guardians or caregivers.

Cases of child sexual abuse are often concluded by the family or extended family of the children agreeing, on the child's behalf, to a settlement offered by the abuser. By cultural norms, children are taught to be subservient to elders and authorities and should also never question male authorities. Men tended to perceive girls who had experienced sexual abuse as 'freely available', while the girls were often blamed for what happened to them. Further evidence from the study suggests that the number of street children was increasing, especially in tourist areas.

The study also revealed that most child victims of commercial sexual exploitation came from a difficult and/or abusive home environment and had experienced sexual abuse. Many of them engaged in commercial sexual exploitation in exchange for food, shelter, accommodation and pocket money. It was also reported that many of them were under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol when they were with clients. Anecdotal evidence indicated that an alarming number of children were being commercially sexually exploited. The current education system usually did not equip children to take advantage of the booming economy.

The perpetrators of sexual exploitation of children were from within the local community, tourists and workers in fishing industries – both local and foreign. Facilitators of that process appeared to include family members, taxi drivers, nightclub owners and workers, security guards, hotel owners and employers, or the girls' boy friends. The study also uncovered evidence that children engaged in the production of child pornography, either as victims during sexual abuse often unknowingly, or as consumers of the extensive range of child pornography widely available.

## Efforts made so far

The study found that although the authorities were committed to addressing the issues, enforcement was severely lacking and professional child-rights sensitivity was virtually unknown. Pacifica had established a National Children's Council, a coordinating body in the implementation of the country's commitment to the Convention on the Rights of the Child through a National Plan for Children. Despite that, there was no overarching policy addressing child sexual abuse and commercial sexual exploitation of children. Memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between relevant Ministries, including the Police Department, were developed to facilitate coordination

among different agencies on the work related to child abuse cases. A national hotline service was available, although it was not mandated to intervene in any form of sexual abuse. Some ad hoc awareness raising activities, including mobile theatre in communities; youth radio, magazine and radio announcements, had been initiated and implemented by non-governmental organizations and church groups, dealing with violence, abuse, neglect and women's and children's rights. A standard approach to care and rehabilitation was lacking, together with a limited referral system and overall lack of professional expertise.

## Appendix III: Matrix for drafting a national plan of action/country strategic plan against CSEC for the imaginary island, "Pacifica"

| **Key areas of action** | **Programme** (what specific programmes/ activities) | **Objectives** (what the identified programmes/ activities want to achieve) | **Project/ Activities** (how to go about achieving the identified objectives = concrete steps to be taken | **Target groups** (whom the project/activity is addressing) | **Actors** (which groups, e.g. government, agencies, NGOs, youth, United Nations, community, private sector, will lead and be involved in the undertaking) | **Indicators of achievement** (how to know the objectives have been achieved = concrete indicators) | **Geographic area** | **Resources needed** | **Time frame** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Prevention** | – What are the main manifestations of CSEC? What are the causes of vulnerability of boys and girls to CSEC (economic opportunities, education, home environment, social services, etc.)? What type of prevention initiatives could address the causes?<br>– Are there cultural norms/ practices/ perceptions that may put boys and girls at risk of CSEC (e.g. gender discrimination, stigmatization, expectations of children, etc.)? How could they be mitigated?<br>– Who are the perpetrators? Who are the facilitators? What forms of relationships do they have with children? How could they be prevented from getting access to children?<br>– How much awareness of CSEC exists among different sectors in society (e.g. communities, teachers, young people, law enforcement agencies, media, policymakers, relevant authorities, relevant private sector(s), etc.? How could they be engaged in combating CSEC?<br>– Are there any gaps in accessibility and availability of educational information for children and families so that they understand CSEC better and better protect themselves? How could these gaps be addressed?<br>– Is reliable CSEC information available to support the development of policy and mechanisms to address the issues? If not, how could this be made available? | | | | | | | | |

| Key areas of action | Programme (what specific programmes/ activities) | Objectives (what the identified programmes/ activities want to achieve) | Project/ Activities (how to go about achieving the identified objectives = concrete steps to be taken | Target groups (whom the project/activity is addressing) | Actors (which groups, e.g. government. agencies, NGOs, youth, United Nations, community, private sector, will lead and be involved in the undertaking) | Indicators of achievement (how to know the objectives have been achieved = concrete indicators) | Geographic area | Resources needed | Time frame |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Protection** | – Are there any gaps in existing legislations to protect children from CSEC (e.g. legal framework, enforcement of the relevant legislation, legal practices, etc.)? How could each of these gaps be addressed?<br>– Are there reporting channels for CSEC cases available? Are there any reporting channels specifically designed for children? If not, how could the establishment of the reporting channels and the reporting channels for children be made possible?<br>– Is there a referral system in place? If not, how could this be developed? Who will need to get involved in establishing this? What is the structure of the referral system?<br>– Is information on child sexual abusers sufficiently shared among relevant agencies for monitoring purposes? How could this information sharing be improved to provide better protection to children?<br>– Could national and regional collaboration be enhanced to strengthen the fight against CSEC? What kind of national and regional collaboration could be possible? Who/which agencies should be involved? | | | | | | | | |

| Key areas of action | Programme (what specific programmes/ activities) | Objectives (what the identified programmes/ activities want to achieve) | Project/ Activities (how to go about achieving the identified objectives = concrete steps to be taken | Target groups (whom the project/activity is addressing) | Actors (which groups, e.g. government, agencies, NGOs, youth, United Nations, community, private sector, will lead and be involved in the undertaking) | Indicators of achievement (how to know the objectives have been achieved = concrete indicators) | Geographic area | Resources needed | Time frame |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Recovery & Reintegration** | – What social services are available to child victims of CSEC? Are those services sufficiently meeting the needs of CSEC child victims? If there are gaps, how could those gaps be addressed?<br>– How accessible are the services for child victims? If there are gaps, how could those gaps be reduced? Which agencies would need to be involved?<br>– Is there any alternative care available to child victims of CSEC other than institutionalization or sending them back home? If so, how sufficient are they to meet the needs of children, and how could they be improved? If not, what alternative care should be available? Which agencies should be involved to make this happen?<br>– Is there a supporting programme to assist child victims to reintegrate into society and lead full and meaningful lives? If available, are there any gaps? If not, how could such a programme be made possible?<br>– Is there any capacity building needed for professionals to assist child victims? If so, how could this need be met? Which agencies should be involved?<br>– Is a child protection system applied in the operation of care institutions? If so, is it standardized? If not, how could this be done? What monitoring system should be in place? Which agencies should be involved? | | | | | | | | |

| Key areas of action | Programme (what specific programmes/ activities) | Objectives (what the identified programmes/ activities want to achieve) | Project/ Activities (how to go about achieving the identified objectives = concrete steps to be taken | Target groups (whom the project/activity is addressing) | Actors (which groups, e.g. government, agencies, NGOs, youth, United Nations, community, private sector, will lead and be involved in the undertaking) | Indicators of achievement (how to know the objectives have been achieved = concrete indicators) | Geographic area | Resources needed | Time frame |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Coordination and Cooperation** | – Does any in-country coordination and/or cooperation to address CSEC exist? If so, which areas of CSEC is this coordination/cooperation addressing? Are there any gaps in this coordination and/or cooperation? If so, how can the gaps be reduced?<br>– Does any bi-lateral or regional coordination exist? How effective is it? If so, which areas of CSEC is this coordination/cooperation addressing? Are there any gaps in this coordination and/or cooperation? If so, how can the gaps be reduced? | | | | | | | | |

| **Key areas of action** | **Programme** (what specific programmes/ activities) | **Objectives** (what the identified programmes/ activities want to achieve) | **Project/ Activities** (how to go about achieving the identified objectives = concrete steps to be taken | **Target groups** (whom the project/activity is addressing) | **Actors** (which groups, e.g. government. agencies, NGOs, youth, United Nations, community, private sector, will lead and be involved in the undertaking) | **Indicators of achievement** (how to know the objectives have been achieved = concrete indicators) | **Geographic area** | **Resources needed** | **Time frame** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Child and Young People Participation** | – Is there an opportunity for children to participate and take action as a key actor in the above four elements in addressing CSEC? If not, how could a mechanism or a channel be developed to ensure involvement of children as key actors?<br>– Are there difficulties in involving children and young people in this regard? Could these difficulties be mitigated?<br>– What support would be needed to support children to develop their own network and build their capacity to work alongside adults to fight CSEC? | | | | | | | | |

# Appendix IV: Media release

United Nations ESCAP

ecpat

Save the Children Fiji

21 November 2007

**MEDIA RELEASE**

The Regional Stakeholders' Consultation and Planning Workshop on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Child Sexual Abuse in the Pacific was attended by government and NGO representatives from Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. The workshop was organized by United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP); End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking of Children for Sexual Purposes (ECPAT); and Save the Children Fiji. It was held at the Holiday Inn in Suva from 19 to 21 November.

The purpose of the workshop was to review key findings of situation analyses recently done by the seven countries to determine the extent of commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) and child sexual abuse (CSA) in those countries and to develop appropriate responses based on existing national and regional commitments on children's rights and protection.

All the countries represented confirmed that there was both commercial sexual exploitation and child sexual abuse in their countries. The commercial sexual exploitation of children occurred when children were used as objects of sexual gratification of others and includes child prostitution, child pornography, improper early marriage, some forms of adoption and child trafficking. Participants at the workshop identified the need for more information on trafficking. CSEC was occurring particularly in industries such as tourism, logging, fisheries and mining. New information technologies, such as the Internet, had led to new or increased forms of exploitation, such as pornography and new exploitation of children for sex.

Commenting on the situation analyses, Professor Vijay Naidu from the University of the South Pacific spoke about the social and economic changes that had been taking place in the Pacific, and how they had created environments that put children at risk. Cash poverty, unemployment, peer pressure, as well as traditional attitudes to women and children, were some of the factors that contribute to the commercial exploitation and abuse of children.

It was agreed that responding to CSEC and CSA required an integrated approach, involving Governments and NGOs. Children themselves should also be included in consultations so they could explain what they wanted in terms of protection.

The participants identified obstacles to combating sexual exploitation and abuse of children: ignorance of the issue of the commercial and sexual exploitation of children, culture used to hide guilt and condone abuses, and putting opportunities to earn money before protecting children's rights which leads to "selling" children for sex. Lack of financing and lack of political commitment were also discussed.

Addressing the issue of future action, the participants worked on developing plans and strategies tailored to the context of their country. The strategies focused on awareness-raising; holding consultations with a wide variety of stake-holders including government ministries, the security forces, faith-based organizations and NGOs;

drafting national plans; gathering base-line data; mapping organizations that deal with CSEC and CSA and reviving those that were dormant; getting the media to support their activities; quantifying the cost of those abuses to a country and, in general, making the work of combating CSEC and CSA more visible so that Governments will prioritize the need for action and resources to address those issues.

# Appendix V: List of participants, facilitators and resource persons

United Nations ESCAP

ecpat

Save the Children Fiji

**Regional Stakeholders' Consultation and Planning Workshop on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) and Child Sexual Abuse in the Pacific**
**19-21 November 2007**
**Suva, Fiji Islands**

***Country delegations***

| Country | Name | Organization | Contact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cook Islands | Mr. Kenneth Ben | Commissioner to the World Mission of Evangelism (CWME) | P.O. Box 188, Rarotonga<br>Fax: (682) 50726<br>Email: kenben@oyster.net.ck |
| | Ms. Angie Tuara Ne Tara | Vice President, Cook Islands Women's Counselling Centre, Punanga Tauturu Inc. | P.O. Box 205, Rarotonga<br>Email: datuara@oyster.net.ck |
| | Ms. Apii Angelo Enua | Violence Against Women and Children, Cook Islands Women's Counselling Centre, Punanga Tauturu Inc., | P.O. Box 205, Rarotonga<br>Email: lrto@pti.org.ck |
| | Ms. Mittane-O-Kairangi Daniela | Child and Youth Officer, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Social Services | P.O. Box 98, Arorangi, Rarotonga<br>Fax: (682) 23-608<br>Email: mii.daniela@intaff.government.ck |
| Kiribati | Ms. Kakiateiti Erikate | Child Protection Manager, Community Development Services, Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs | P.O. Box 75, Bairiki, Tarawa<br>Fax: (686) 29270<br>Email: yashi_bibi@yahoo.com.au |
| | Mr. Teuraki Ukenio | Acting Deputy Director, Community Development Services Division, Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs | P.O. Box 75, Bairiki, Tarawa<br>Fax: + 686 21133<br>Email: teurakai_ukenio@yahoo.com |
| Kiribati | Ms. Roko Timeon | Director<br>Kiribati Association of Non-governmental Organizations (KANGO) | P.O. Box 162, Bririki, Tarawa<br>Fax: (686) 22819<br>Email: kango@tskl.net.ki |
| Papua New Guinea | Ms. Ume Wainetti | Program Coordinator, Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee, Consultative Implementation Monitoring Council | P.O. Box 1530, Port Moresby<br>Fax: (675) 321-7223<br>Email: Ume.Wainetti@cimcPapua New Guinea.org |
| | Ms. Rosa Au | Deputy Chairperson, Family and Sexual Violence Action Committee | P.O. Box 1530, Port Moresby-National Capital District<br>Fax: (675) 321-7223<br>Email: Ume.Wainetti@cimcPapua New Guinea.org |

| Country | Name | Organization | Contact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Samoa | Ms. Kuiniselani Tago | Assistant Chief Executive Officer, Division for Women, Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development | Private Bag 872, Apia<br>Fax: (685) 22539<br>Email: lani_tago@lesamoa.net |
| | Ms. Salanieta Uesele | Administrative Officer/Chief Executive Officer, Mapusaga O Aiga Inc (MOA) – Family Haven | P.O. Box 3676, Suite J, Nia Mall, Saleufi, Apia<br>Fax: 685-22549<br>Email: moa@samoa.ws |
| | Ms. Ana Kolia | Assistant Secretary of National Council of Churches in Samoa | P.O. Box 2266, Apia<br>Fax: (685) 24343<br>Email: ffkolia@lesamoa.net.ws |
| Solomon Islands | Mr. Aaron Rubi | Director of Social Welfare, Social Welfare Division, Ministry of Health and Medical Services | P.O. Box 349, Honiara<br>Fax: (677) 20085<br>Email: aolofia@moh.government.sb |
| | Ms. Moddie Nanau | Senior Programs Officer, Solomon Islands Broadcasting Corporation (Chairperson of the Board, Vois Blong Mere Solomon Islands and Member of the Solomon Islands National Advisory Committee on Children), Honiara | Fax: (677) 23300<br>Email: mnanau@sibc.com.sb |
| | Sister Doreen Awaiasi | Centre Coordinator, Christian Care Centre | P.O. Box 1569, Honiara<br>Fax: (677) 22807 or 79326<br>Email: ccc@solomon.com.sb |
| | Ms. Florence Taro | Police Officer, Sexual Assault Unit, Police Headquarters | P.O. Box 63, Honiara<br>Fax: (677) 20616<br>Email: taroflorence@yahoo.com.au |
| | Ms. Lovelyn Kwaoga | Centre Counsellor, Family Support Centre | P.O. Box 1725, Honiara<br>Fax: (677) 20619<br>Email: lkwaoga@solomon.com.sb |
| Vanuatu | Ms. Agatha Malsungai | Legal Officer, Vanuatu Women's Crisis Centre | P.O. Box 1358, Port Vila<br>Fax: (678) 22478<br>Email: vwnc@vanuatu.com.vu |
| | Ms. Flora Bani-Kalsaria | Chairperson, National Children's Committee, Department of Economic and Social Development | PMB 9008, Port Vila<br>Fax: (678) 23087<br>Email: fkalsaria@vanuatu.government.vu |
| | Ms. Leias Victoria Kaltovei | Child Rights Project Officer, Save the Children Australia, Vanuatu Field Officer | P.O. Box 283, Port Vila Fax:<br>Email: crp@sca.org.vu |
| Fiji Islands | Mrs. Litia Mawi | Permanent Secretary, Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing | GPO Box 14068, Suva<br>Fax: (679) 3303829<br>Email: lmawi@governmentnet.government.fj |
| | Mrs. Iisapeci Rokotuinidau | Director for Social Welfare, Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing | GPO Box 14068, Suva<br>Fax: (679) 3305110<br>Email: lrokotunidau@governmentnet.government.fj |

| Country | Name | Organization | Contact |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Mrs. Arieta Tagiveitaua | Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing | GPO Box 14068, Suva<br>Fax: (679) 3305110<br>Email: atagiveitaua@governmentnet.government.fj |
| | Ms. Sova Colavanua | Legal Officer, Fiji Human Rights Commission | PMG, Suva<br>Fax: (679) 3308661 |
| | Ms. Marjorie Whippy | Ministry for Women, Social Welfare and Housing | GPO Box 14068, Suva<br>Fax: (679) 3303829<br>Email: Marjorie.whippy@governmentnet.government.fj |
| | Inspector Salasceni Vakatuturagani | Officer in Charge,<br>Nabua Police Station,<br>Fiji Police Force | P.O. Box 239, Suva<br>Fax: 3385830 |
| Fiji Islands | Ms. Sera Bogitini | Project Officer, Fiji Women's Crisis Centre | P.O. Box 4029, Labasa, Suva<br>Fax: 679-8814609<br>Email: lwcc@connect.com.fj |

***Save the Children Fiji***

| Name | Title | Contact |
|---|---|---|
| Mr. John Errington | Acting Chief Executive Officer | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214<br>Email: jerrington@savethechildren.org.fj |
| Ms. Iris Low | Child Rights Manager, | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214<br>Email: ilow@savethechildren.org.fj |
| Ms. Lynette Petueli | Programs Manager | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214<br>Email: lpetueli@savethechildren.org.fj |
| Ms. Frances Pene | Meeting Rapporteur | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |
| Ms. Alika Cooper | Photographer | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |
| Ms. Courtney Underwood | Save the Children organizing Team | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |
| Ms. Rachana Kumari | Save the Children organizing Team | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |
| Ms. Sera Vulavou | Save the Children organizing Team/ Kids Link alumni | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |
| Ms. Susie Anise | Save the Children organizing Team | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |
| Ms. Veena Singh | Save the Children organizing Team | P.O. Box 2249, Government Buildings, Suva<br>Fax: 3302214 |

*Organizers and facilitators*

| Organization | Name | Title | Contact |
|---|---|---|---|
| United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) | Ms. Vanessa Griffen | Chief,<br>Gender and Development Section<br>Social Development Division | United Nations Building, Floor 6A,<br>Rajadamnern Nok Avenue,<br>Bangkok 10200, Thailand<br>Fax: (66 2) 288 1018<br>Email: griffen@un.org |
| ECPAT International | Ms. Kritsana Pimonsaengsuriya | Regional Officer for East Asia and the Pacific, ECPAT International | 328 Phaya Thai Road<br>Bangkok 10400, Thailand<br>Fax: (66 2) 215 8272<br>Email: kritsana@ecpat.net |
| ECPAT International | Mr. Tom Shafer | Program Officer Care and Protection<br>ECPAT International | 328/1 Phaya Thai Road<br>Bangkok 10400, Thailand<br>Fax: (66 2) 215 8272<br>Email: thomass@ecpat.net |

*United Nations Agencies and Pacific Regional Organisations*

| Organization | Name | Title | Contact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International | Ms. Margaret Leniston | Regional Health Programme Manager | P.O. Box 18006, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 3312 298<br>Email: margaret.leniston@fspi.org.fj |
| International Labour Organization (ILO)<br>Fiji Office | Mr. Jesse Anderson | Information Technology Administrative Assistant | Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 3300 248<br>Email: jesse@ilo.org |
| Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) | Mr. Matthew Leslie | Regional Security Advisor | Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 3300 192<br>Email: matthewl@forumsec.org.fj |
| Regional Rights Resource Team | Ms. Sandra Bernklau | Project Manager | Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 3306 582<br>Email: Sandra@RRRT.org.fj |
| United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) | Ms. Johanna Eriksson Takyo | Chief<br>Child Protection<br>Programme Pacific Region | UNICEF Pacific<br>Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 330 1667<br>Email: suva@unicef.org |
| United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) | Ms. Sally Cobb | Programme Coordination Assistant for End Violence against Women | Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 3301 654<br>Email: sally.cobb@unifem.org |

| Organization | Name | Title | Contact |
|---|---|---|---|
| United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Pacific Centre | Mr. Thomas Shanahan | Research Analyst for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building | Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji<br>Fax: (679) 3301 976<br>Email: thomas.shanahan@undp.org |
| University of the South Pacific | Prof. Vijay Naidu | Professor and Director | Development Studies Program<br>Pacific Institute of Advanced Studies in Development and Governance<br>University of the South Pacific<br>Laucala Bay Campus<br>Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji Islands<br>Tel: (679) 323 2093<br>Fax: (679) 323 1523/ 323 1524<br>Email: naidu_v@usp.ac.fj |

# Appendix VI: PACIFIC STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT[5] 19 SEPTEMBER 2003

We, the representatives of Governments and civil society organizations from the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu, gathered in Nadi, Fiji, between 15-19 September 2003, at the Pacific Regional Workshop on Combating Poverty and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth,

*Reviewed and assessed* the progress made in the Pacific region to prevent the commercial sexual exploitation and sexual abuse of children and its socio-economic context,

*Developed and strengthened* technical expertise and knowledge on the issue, enabling nation states to advance actions to protect children and youth against this grave crime in each of our countries and territories,

*Declare our commitment* to develop and consolidate regional partnerships in the Pacific to fight all forms of commercial sexual exploitation of children, including child prostitution, child pornography and the trafficking of children for sexual purposes; also, to build upon the networks established at this forum to effectively address the issue through concrete regional initiatives and provision of mutual support,

*Confirm* our commitment to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and to the Stockholm Declaration and Agenda for Action, adopted at the First World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, Stockholm, August 1996, and re-affirmed at the Second World Congress, Yokohama, December 2001, and we acknowledge the importance of the development and implementation of national plans of action to combat this phenomenon based on traditional values which are consistent with this commitment, We, individually and collectively, making full use of our capacity and the positions that we hold within our respective Government agencies and civil society organizations, agree to undertake all action to achieve this end, and

*Hereby proclaim* our commitment by adopting this statement.

Signed:

Representatives of all participating government agencies and civil society organizations.

[5] Adopted by participants of the meeting entitled "Pacific Regional Workshop on Combating Poverty and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Youth" organized by ESCAP, ECPAT and UNICEF. The workshop was held in Nadi, Fiji, in September 2003.

## كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

**如何购取联合国出版物**

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

**HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

**COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

**КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

**CÓMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

United Nations publication
Sales No. E.08.II.F.18
Copyright © United Nations 2008
ISBN: 978-92-1-120551-0
ST/ESCAP/2511

Printed in Bangkok
November 2008 – 1,230





UNITED NATIONS
ESCAP
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

United Nations
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
Social Development Division
United Nations Building, Rajadamnern Nok Avenue
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: +66 2 2881572
Fax: +66 2 2881018
E-mail: gad@un.org
Website: http://www.unescap.org

2 004000 133872