

RMA

INITIAL ASSESSMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF IIOC - INCORPORATING CPORT/CASIC

GUIDANCE PUBLISHED 2022



**REDUCING
SERIOUS HARM**

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Risk assessment is a process by which risk is understood. It involves –

- Identifying and gathering relevant information
- Analysing the information to consider what is relevant to an individual's risk
- Evaluating risk against the relevant risk criteria
- Communication of outcomes to inform decision making and action.

By assessing risk we seek to estimate how likely the event is to occur and the nature and the seriousness of it (RMA, 2011).

PURPOSE OF THIS ASSESSMENT

This framework is for adult males (18+) whose index offences include convictions for indecent images of children. It provides a structured decision making process that assists in identifying those that are of lower or higher likelihood of committing a contact sexual offence.

The framework adopts the following structure:

- Considering the pattern, nature, seriousness of offending to date
- Administering the CPORT & CASIC
- Considering the likelihood of committing a contact offence
- Producing a narrative analysis of offending (P/N/S/L)
- Evaluating against the criteria of antisociality and sexual interest in children
- Recommending an appropriate response and offering a conclusion.

Please note: you must not share, amend or re-produce this document at any time. Any requests must go through a change request process. If you have any questions regarding this document please contact: info@rma.gov.scot

SECTION 1: PATTERN OF OFFENDING

In terms of the pattern of offending, consider onset, duration, frequency and escalation. That is, when did the individual start offending, how often have they offended, how long have they been involved in committing a particular type of offence and has the offending escalated over time? Consider whether the offending is diverse and whether it has escalated in terms of the seriousness or frequency over time.

1.1 Summary of Offence History

Note the number of known/documented incidents of (a) non-violent/non sexual offences, (b) violent offences and (c) sexual offences: contact and (d) sexual offence: non-contact. In addition, note the age the individual was when the first of each type of incident was recorded and the age the individual was when the most recent incident or offence occurred.

Exact numbers are not expected but there should be an indication of the amount of each type of offence.

Consider all offending and not just behaviour that has caused personal injury. Any reliably documented incidents – not only convictions – should be considered. For example, offences dealt with via the Children's Hearing System.

See Appendix A for definition and classification of offences.

1.2 Is the offending increasing in frequency, seriousness, or diversity?

Consider whether the offending has changed over time in terms of:

- **Frequency** (is the individual offending more often?)
- **Seriousness** (is the degree of harm becoming more serious?)
- **Diversity** (is the individual committing more types of offences?)

The notes field can be used to record anything else which is judged to be particularly relevant or salient in the context of the pattern of offending that is not otherwise captured.

SECTION 2: NATURE OF OFFENDING

The nature of offending encompasses consideration of the type of offending and the victim(s).

2.1 What types of offending are evident from previous convictions information, file review and interviews?

From a review of available information sources highlight the broad types of offending that the individual has been involved in by ticking all that apply. Consider both previous and current offending.

2.2 Consider who has/have been the victims in the individual's offending

This section is about indicating victim characteristics across previous and current offending.

For each of the broad types of offending, consider who the victims have been and highlight (by ticking all that apply) whether the victims were:

- A child/adolescent or adult
- Male and/or female

Next, for each broad types of offending, consider the relationship of the individual to their victim(s) and highlight (by ticking all that apply) whether they were:

- Strangers
- Family members
- Other non-stranger
- Not known

The notes field can be used to record anything else which is judged to be particularly relevant or salient in the context of the nature of offending that is not otherwise captured.

SECTION 3: SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENDING

Seriousness combines the degree of harm done, the degree of harm intended and the extent of planning in an episode of offending.

This complex consideration is necessary to inform consideration of 'risk of serious harm': an act may have led to permanent disfigurement but might not have been intended; conversely, an act may have led to minor injury but the intent may have been to inflict serious injury.

Consider all episodes of offending - past and current - identify the degree of harm caused, the intent and the planning and tick all that apply to refine your understanding of the seriousness of offending to date.

3.1 Highlight the degrees of harm that are known to have occurred/that were intended

Understanding the specific impact on each victim is subjective. However this is about considering the impact that would be reasonably expected of the individual's offending. This can range from relatively minor (i.e. minimal) such as causing disturbance or nuisance but without personal loss or any injury, through to lethal or catastrophic harm, such as a fatality or multiple fatalities. Consider the harm that is known to have occurred in addition to the harm that was intended.

3.2 Consider intent further and where offending has been: accidental, negligent, reckless or deliberate

Consider the degree of harm caused in addition to the individual's intent, knowledge or disregard of the harm that may be expected from the individual's behaviour.

The intent may not always be known however, there should be consideration of the actual and intended consequences and whether the offending was accidental, negligent, reckless and/or deliberate.

3.3 Do the current offences represent a de-escalation?

Consider the degree of harm caused in addition to the individual's intent, knowledge or disregard of the harm that may be expected from the individual's behaviour.

The intent may not always be known however, there should be consideration of the actual and intended consequences and whether the offending was accidental, negligent, reckless and/or deliberate.

SECTION 4: ADMINISTER CPORT AND CASIC

The Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool¹ (CPORT) is a 7 item risk assessment tool designed to predict any sexual recidivism amongst adult male offenders who have a conviction for a child pornography offence².

Item 5 of the CPORT relates to admission of sexual interest in children or evidence of a diagnosis of paedophilia/hebephilia. Given concerns that admission is vulnerable to faking or refusal to respond when those being assessed are asked about sexual interests, the authors developed the Correlates of Admission of Sexual Interest in Children Scale³ (CASIC) which is a six item scale.

As the CASIC can provide valuable information to inform the overall assessment, it should always be completed even if CPORT item 5 can be 'scored' without considering the additional 6 items within the CASIC.

INITIAL ASSESSMENT - CPORT/CASIC GUIDANCE

This is an adapted and summarised version of the Scoring Guide for the CPORT & CASIC⁴. The original and full guidance can be found **HERE**.

Each of the items should be marked as either **Yes (Y)**, **No (N)** or **Unknown (U)**.

The authors of the tool do not recommend using CPORT if more than one item is missing. Therefore, where more than one of items 1 to 7 is marked as 'unknown', more information should be obtained to assure valid use of the method.

The rule about the maximum number of 'unknowns' permitted applies to the CPORT items only and not the CASIC items (items 5a-5f).

Assessors applying the method in Scotland should be aware that, as a result of differences between jurisdictions, it is highly unlikely that information will be available for items 5c of the CASIC and item 7 of the CPORT. Therefore, both these items will likely always be scored as 'Unknown'.

¹ Seto & Eke, 2015

² Whilst the authors would prefer to use the term *child sexual exploitation material* (CSEM) to capture the nature and content of the criminal behaviour involved, the term *child pornography* is used in the CPORT as that is the legal term in Canada - where the tool was developed. For our purposes in Scotland, we have, wherever possible, replaced the term *child pornography* with *indecent images of children*.

³ Seto & Eke, 2017

⁴ With thanks to the authors for permission to adapt the text from the original guide: Eke, A. W., Helmus, M., & Seto, M. C. (2018). Scoring Guide for the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT): Version 2. Available online - [CPORTGuideV2EkeHelmusSeto20June2018\(3\).pdf](#)

Item 1: Offender age at time of index investigation, 35 or younger?

Mark as **Yes** if the individual was 35 years old or younger at the time the police began their investigation.

What to use when coding:
• Calculation based on date police began investigation
• Initial focus of investigation may not have involved IIOC matters
• For cases reported outwith Scotland, the index date is the day the investigation by Police Scotland began
• If age at investigation is not known, other age variable could be used, but with a caveat

Consider the age the individual was at the time the police began their investigation.

IIOC offences do not need to have been the initial focus of the police investigation. For example:

- An officer attends a road traffic accident and IIOC material is found in the vehicle (the index investigation date is the day the police attended the accident).
- Whilst investigating an allegation about a sexual assault, IIOC material is found in the individual's home (the index investigation date is the day the police became aware of the sexual assault allegation).

If the individual came to the attention of authorities from another jurisdiction, the index investigation date is the date Police Scotland were made aware of the case.

Cases where age at investigation is unknown: Use other information to conclude whether the person was 35 or younger at time of investigation (e.g. within the original, Canadian sample, most court cases were concluded within 15 months of the initial investigation.) In such circumstances, assessors would need to comment on the fact different age info was used and that it might impact on the score.

Background:

Younger age is well established as a risk factor for recidivism across individuals who commit different types of offences, including sex offences more generally⁵ and IIOC offences specifically⁶. In the general literature, age is one of the strongest and most universal correlates of crime⁷.

⁵ Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

⁶ Eke, A. W., Seto, M. C., & Williams, J. (2011); Wakeling, H. C., Howard, P., & Barnett, G. (2011).

⁷ Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1993).

Item 2: Any prior criminal history?

Mark as **Yes** if the individual has any previous criminal charges.

What to use when coding:
• Criminal charges (regardless of outcome)
• All previous criminal charges (sexual or otherwise) including offences dealt with via the children's hearing system
• Do not count non-criminal charges (eg. road traffic offences such as speeding fines or parking fines)
• Do not count historical offences committed in the past that result in charges at index (ie. do not consider index offences)
• Do not count self-report

Include any previously detected offences – sexual or otherwise - that have resulted in a criminal charge regardless of the outcome (e.g. the charge was withdrawn).

Do not include non-criminal charges such as road traffic offences.

Also exclude offences committed in the past that result in charges at the index investigation. For example:

- An individual is charged at the index investigation for a sexual assault that occurred 5 years ago. The sexual assault would not be considered 'prior criminal history' because it was unknown/undetected until the index set of charges.
- Do not score based on self-report. Further research is needed to determine whether self-report can be used instead of official records.

Background:

It is well established that previous criminal history is a recidivism risk factor for many different types of offender, including those who commit sexual offences more generally⁸, and specifically those involved in IIOC offences⁹. Among general offenders, criminal history is the strongest of the Central Eight risk factors¹⁰.

⁸ Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

⁹ Seto, M. C., & Eke, A. W. (2005); Wakeling, H. C., Howard, P., & Barnett, G. (2011).

¹⁰ Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010).

Item 3: Any failure on conditional release, including charge at index?

This item is scored as **Yes** for any type of failure on conditional release (e.g. whilst subject to statutory supervision via a Community Payback Order or release licence), either before to, or at the time of the index investigation for IIOC offences.

What to use when coding:
• Previous or Index failure on conditional release
• Detected offence with formal response
• Criminal charges (regardless of outcome)
• Do not count self-report

These are detected breaches or technical violations for which there was a formal response such as a charge for a new offence whilst subject to statutory supervision or revocation of community supervision order or release licence.

Criminal charges are counted regardless of outcome (e.g. the charge was withdrawn).

Examples include failure to attend for court, a technical breach of statutory supervision - CPO or release licence (e.g. not reporting as required), a failure to abide by conditions relating to use of the internet or computers, or being around children without a responsible adult present.

Background:

Failure on conditional release is another well-established criminal risk factor, where those who have not been able to comply with bail, a community payback order or parole conditions are more likely to further break rules by committing new crimes. This has been demonstrated among those involved in sexual offences more generally.¹¹

¹¹ Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

Item 4: Any contact sexual offending, including charge at index?

This item is scored as **Yes** if there has been any previous or current contact offending. These are detected sexual offences for which there was a formal response (criminal charge or conviction). Criminal charges count regardless of outcome (e.g. the charge was withdrawn).

What to use when coding:
• Sexual offence with formal response
• Criminal charges (regardless of outcome)
• Contact offence (included any touching of a sexual nature)
• Do not count invitation to sexual touching
• Offences in the past that result in charges at index
• Do not count self-report

Contact offences include any contact of a sexual nature.

This item includes offences committed in the past that have resulted in charges at the index investigation. For example:

- The individual was charged at the index investigation for a sexual assault that occurred 2 years previously but that has just come to light. This sexual assault would not be considered as previous criminal history (item 2) as it was undetected/ unknown until the index investigation – but it would count here because index offences are included.
- After media reports of the IIOC charges, victims come forward with reports of past contact sexual offending by the individual.
- The IIOC depict evidence of contact sexual offending by the individual.

This item does not include offences where there was no sexual contact. For example - invitation to sexual touching such as during online chat.

Do not score based on self-report. Further research is needed to determine whether self-report can be used instead of official records.

Background:

Evidence of contact sexual offending is a risk factor for sexual recidivism¹² including amongst those who commit IIOC offences¹³.

Individuals involved in IIOC offending who have no known history of contact sexual offending might have individual characteristics (e.g. high empathy, high self-control) or situational factors (e.g. stable family and social ties, limited access to children) that help prevent contact sexual offending.

Further, dual offenders (those who have committed both IIOC and contact sexual offences) are more likely to be paedophilic than either IIOC only offenders or contact offenders with no history of IIOC offending.¹⁴ Being sexually interested in children is a well-established risk factor for sexual recidivism among individuals who commit non-internet sexual offences¹⁵.

¹² Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

¹³ Eke, A. W., Seto, M. C., & Williams, J. (2011); Wakeling, H. C., Howard, P., & Barnett, G. (2011).

¹⁴ Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & VanZuylen, H. (2015).

¹⁵ Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1998); Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

Item 5: Indication of paedophilic or hebephilic interests?

This item is scored as **Yes** if there is admission and/or evidence of a diagnosis of paedophilia or hebephilia.

Further, if 3 or more of the Correlates of Admission of Sexual Interest in Children items (CASIC, items 5a - 5f) are **Yes** then the CPORT item 5 should be **Yes**.

Where there is sufficient evidence which allows item 5 to be scored as **Yes** even before applying the CASIC items (5a - 5f), completing the CASIC is still advised as it can help inform any management plan/plan for intervention.

What to use when coding:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Admission to police of sexual interest in child material, masturbating to child material or general sexual interest in children.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Do not count if admission was to an undercover officer (individual was not aware the person was a police officer) or to others online (e.g. in chats)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Do not count non-specific responses; responses not directly related to sexual interest in children
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reporting previous diagnosis of sexual interest in children
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Collateral evidence of formal diagnosis pre-index (but not post-index)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">CASIC score of 3 or more (i.e. if 3 or more of items 5a to 5f are Yes)

Paedophilia is clinically defined as a persistent, intense sexual interest in prepubescent children, whereas hebephilia is clinically defined as a persistent, intense sexual interest in pubescent children.

Pubescent children are typically between the ages of 11 and 14 whereas prepubescent children are typically under the age of 11 years old. Age is a proxy for developmental stage, however, because of variation in the age of onset of puberty.

Hebephilia should not be confused with a sexual interest in post pubertal adolescents who are nonetheless below the legal age of consent (e.g. sexually mature looking 15 year olds, when the age of consent is 16).

This item involves admissions to police or information based on formal clinical assessment.

Admissions to police regarding sexual interest in the child material items (CPORT items 6-7), masturbating to the child material, or sexual interest in children in general would score as Yes.

Do not score **Yes** where:

- Comments made by the individual were non-specific. For example 'I have a problem' is not sufficient. The admission would have to be in the context of a discussion about sexual interest in children and/or images relating to children (e.g. 'I have a problem, I can't help it, the pictures turn me on' or admissions about use 'I like to masturbate to this material when I am feeling stressed or feeling lonely').
- The individual did not know they were talking to a police officer (e.g. online undercover officer in a chat room.)
- Admissions of sexual interest in children were made after conviction (e.g. during court report assessment.)

Background:

Research has repeatedly shown that individuals who have sexually offended and have paedophilic interests are more likely to sexually reoffend than individuals without paedophilic interests.¹⁶ In some studies, paedophilia and hebephilia are combined, such that individuals who are sexually attracted to pubescent children are still considered paedophiles.

The CASIC items (5a-5f)

If 3 or more of these items are **Yes** then CPORT item 5 should be **Yes**.

It is defensible to use a CASIC score of 3 or more as evidence that CPORT item 5 is present, regardless of the number of CASIC items missing. However, do not score CPORT item 5 as No if the CASIC score is less than 3 AND more than 1 CASIC item is missing, because the missing CASIC items might be present and would have increased the score to 3 or more if known.

Item 5a: Never Married

Mark as **Yes** if the individual has never been married by the time the index investigation started.

'Never Married' individuals may have relationships but did not live together in an intimate-partner relationship. Living with roommates or extended family members do not count.

Mark as **No** if the individual was separated, divorced, widowed or had lived with an intimate partner at any point leading up to the index investigation. The length of time spent living together within an intimate relationship is not considered. Rather, an indication of some commitment to the intimate relationship (e.g. moved in together, combined finances) should be used to determine whether the individual can be marked as **No**.

Item 5b: Indecent images of children material: Video

Mark as **Yes** if the individual has collected or accessed video content of sexual acts involving children and/or the focus is sexual organs or anal region of a child. This is regardless of whether the content has been downloaded or saved and regardless of the length of the video (include partial video clips).

Video content refers to any video medium (tapes, digital movie files); 'homemade' videos (videos of sexual abuse perpetrated by the individual) as well as those traded by others (of their abuse of children) or commercially produced.

Item 5c: Indecent images of children material: stories

Mark as **Yes** if the individual has collected and/or accessed online (regardless of whether the content has been downloaded or saved), any text stories depicting sex with children. This includes:

- any type of story (e.g. stories of incest or kidnapping and sexual assault of an unknown child)
- Fantasy based or stories documenting sexual offences perpetrated by the individual
- 'Manuals' or 'bulletins' outlining how to sexually offend against a child (e.g. how to groom a child and their parents; how to introduce sex to a child).

Note: as a result of differences between jurisdictions, assessors in Scotland are unlikely to have information to allow this item to be scored. Therefore, this item is likely be marked as '**Unknown**'.

¹⁶ Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1998); Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

Item 5d: Evidence of interest in indecent images of children material spanned two or more years

Mark as **Yes** if there is evidence the individual has accessed or collected material involving IIOC for at least 2 years.

This does not require continuous or regular activity over 2 years and any type of material involving IIOC is counted (e.g. images or text stories, collected offline or online). Information used to calculate the duration of interest in such material could include:

- A previous arrest or charge for offences involving IIOC
- Information the individual shared in online conversations (e.g. indicated in a chat that he has collected for 2+ years)
- Information shared in an interview (e.g. indicated he has been accessing IIOC material for 2+ years).

Item 5e: Volunteering in a role with high access to children

Mark as **Yes** if the individual was in a volunteering role - before or at point of index investigation – where high access to children was expected.

Examples include, volunteering in child-serving organisations such as Boy Scouts or Girl Guides, a children’s programme at a local church, coaching a children’s sports team or running an after-school activity.

Do not mark as **Yes** if access only occurred:

- around related children
- being around children for social reasons (e.g. attending a school event or visiting friends with children)
- being around children as a result of employment (e.g. schoolteacher)

Do not mark as **Yes** if volunteer work involved unexpected or incidental access to children (e.g. volunteering at a home for the elderly where a children’s choir occasionally perform).

Item 5f: Engaging in online sexual communications with a minor or officer posing as minor

Mark as **Yes** if there has been any online sexual communication with a child, or an undercover officer posing as a child.

This item is considering sexual communication with a minor that is inappropriate or non-normative. For example, it should not apply to a parent or a school counsellor who shares sex education content with their child through email. Include any type of online communication (email, instant messaging) that had a sexual component to it. Sexual communications include:

- asking the child if they had engaged in masturbation
- asking the child if they had an intimate relationship or would like one
- asking the child if they were interested in learning about sex
- sharing sexual images or sexual text with the child
- indicating they wanted to have sex with the child

Mark as **Yes** regardless of whether the individual attempted to arrange an offline meeting, or showed up for a meeting with the child/undercover officer.

This item could also be scored if charge/convictions as a result of the individual engaging in

Item 6: More boy than girl content in the indecent images of children material

Mark as **Yes** if more than half of the individual's IIOC material included boys.

What to use when coding:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only IIOC material/sexually explicit depiction of those under 18 is considered for this item
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adults within the content are not counted
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Child nudity or other (non-sexually explicit) content is not counted (see item 7)

Background:

This variable likely represents atypical sexual interests; men who sexually offend against boys are more likely to be diagnosed as paedophilic than those who offend only against girls.

Having a sexual interest in boys is associated with a greater likelihood of persistence in contact sexual offending.¹⁷

Those with a sexual interest in boys may also be higher in emotional congruence with children; with emotional and intimacy needs fulfilled by children rather than adults.¹⁸

Item 7: More boy than girl content in the nude/other child material

Mark as **Yes** if more than half of any non-sexually explicit material included boys.

What to use when coding:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only (non-sexually explicit) child nudity or other material is considered for this item
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Child nudity and other child content would involve individuals under 18 years of age, clothed, nude or in stages of undress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adults within the content are not counted
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• IIOC/sexually explicit content is not counted (see Item 6)

Background:

A person with a sexual interest in children may find a variety of material sexually stimulating, not only depictions of IIOC.¹⁹ This can include depictions of nude children that are not sexually explicit, children in underwear or swimsuits and children who are not fully clothed.

Note: as a result of differences between jurisdictions, assessors in Scotland are unlikely to have information to allow this item to be scored. Therefore, this item is likely be marked as **'Unknown'**.

¹⁷ Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1998); Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005).

¹⁸ E.g. see Underhill, J., Wakeling, H. C., Mann, R. E., & Webster, S. D. (2008); McPhail, I. V., Hermann, C. A., Fernandez, Y. M. (2014); McPhail, I. V., Hermann, C. A., & Nunes, K. L. (2013).

¹⁹ E.g. Krone, T. (2004); Quayle, E. & Taylor, M. (2003).

SECTION 5: LIKELIHOOD OF OFFENDING

Consider in particular the presence of factors associated with the likelihood of contact offending.

Individuals with an anti-social orientation (see items 1-4 of CPORT) plus a sexual interest in children (see item 5 of CPORT) are more likely to commit contact offending compared to internet only offenders (who may have a sexual interest in children but are not generally anti-social).

5.1 Is there evidence of anti-sociality?

Consider the responses to items 1-4 of the CPORT:

Any response of '**yes**' provides evidence of anti-sociality. Assessors will consider the extent of anti-sociality at Section 7.1.

5.2 Is there evidence of a sexual interest in children?

Consider items 5a - 5f.

If 3 or more of these CASIC items are 'yes' then the CPORT item 5 is scored as '**yes**' and item 5.2 should also be '**yes**'. Assessors will consider the extent of sexual interest in children at Section 7.2.

5.3 Does this individual have access to children as a result of their employment, voluntary role, family situation or other circumstances?

5.4 Does this individual have prosocial characteristics or circumstances that reduce the likelihood of committing a contact sexual offence?

There is evidence that IIOC offenders who have no prior contact offending may have prosocial characteristics or circumstances that prevent them from contact offending²⁰. For example, research has indicated that those who commit IIOC offences may have more psychological barriers to contact sexual offending such as greater victim empathy and less antisocial tendencies²¹.

Consider the presence and relevance of prosocial characteristics or circumstances that may reduce the likelihood of the individual committing a contact sexual offence. For example, is the individual someone with no or very few previous convictions? Are they somebody who is in employment and places a great deal of value in and commitment to their work? Does the individual have positive and close relationship with friends and/or family members who are pro-social? Does the individual evidence clear pro-social values and accept responsibility for their actions?

The notes field can be used to record anything else which is judged to be particularly relevant or salient in the context of the likelihood of further offending that is not otherwise captured.

²⁰ Faust, Bickart, Renaud & Camp, 2015

²¹ Babchishin et al., 2014; Long, Alison & McManus, 2013

SECTION 6: ANALYSIS OF OFFENDING

The purpose of this section is to produce an analysis of the pattern, nature, seriousness and likelihood of offending in narrative form – to convey the key risks relating to an individual's offending in meaningful language. This analysis should bring together the information and your understanding from previous sections: Section 1 (the CPORT/CASIC) through to Section 5 (Likelihood).

Ensure the type(s) of risk are specified within this analysis (i.e. the likelihood of what type of offending). This is important when offering a conclusion on what might be an appropriate and proportionate response.

Summarise the analysis of offending by providing a concise statement in narrative form and plain English.

- **Pattern** – summarise the pattern of offending, considering the onset, the duration of offending, the frequency of such and if there has been escalation in offending.
- **Nature** – summarise the nature of offending, considering the diversity of offending and the victims of such.
- **Seriousness** – summarise the seriousness of offending, considering the harm caused by episodes of offending as well as the intended harm and the planning involved in offending.
- **Likelihood** – summarise the likelihood of offending, considering the balance of risk and protective factors/strengths. Consider the nature and seriousness of likely future offending. This should detail what factors might contribute to increased risk or conversely what factors might mitigate risk.

SECTION 7: EVALUATION

This section requires the assessor, based on their assessment and analysis of offending, to conclude on the relevant risk criteria. In the context of this assessment, it is about identifying in particular, those who evidence a sexual interest in children plus a higher level of antisociality and in order to identify those who may be more likely to progress onto contact offending which should aid decisions about an appropriate and proportionate response.

That is, little or minimal intervention may be appropriate for those individuals with few factors associated with reoffending, lower levels of antisociality and sexual interest in children whilst supervision or further assessment for risk of serious harm would be appropriate for those individuals with higher levels of antisociality and sexual interest in children.

7.1 Based on the assessment as a whole is there evidence of a lower or higher indication of antisocial orientation?

At Section 5, the presence of anti-sociality was considered. Here, consider how antisocial (or otherwise) the individual is.

Low antisocial orientation could be indicated by minimal criminal history, evidence of compliance with rules and conditions or, where offending has not been particularly frequent, serious or diverse.

Conversely a higher antisocial orientation may be characterised by evidence of a significant criminal history, breaking rules and conditions, or where offending has been frequent, serious and/ or diverse.

The first four items of the CPORT relate to antisociality/criminality. Evidence suggests that antisocial behaviour and orientation may differ between those who commit IIOC offences and those who commit contact offences, with contact offenders being found to be more antisocial²².

Consider the responses to items 1-4 of the CPORT and any other indicators of antisocial behaviour/ orientation within the overall analysis of offending to date (Section 6).

Some aspects to consider could include:

- Is this a first offence or is there a pattern/ emerging pattern? Low criminal history and compliance with court orders may be indicative of prosocial behaviour.²³
- How old was the individual when they started offending/ how old were they at the time of charged with this IIOC offending? Being younger in age has been found to be a risk factor for recidivism amongst those who commit IIOC offences.²⁴
- What has their response been to any previous periods of supervision such as supervised bail, SOPO's, community supervision orders or release licences (CPORT item 3 examines any prior, or index failure on conditions)? Those who do not comply with supervision orders or licence conditions may be more likely to be involved in further rule breaking e.g. being involved in further offending. General offending and failure to comply with court orders are indicative of rule breaking behaviour.²⁵
- Has the individual been involved in both contact and non-contact sexual offending? Dual offenders, those who have committed both contact and IIOC offences, have been found to have the highest rates of recidivism.²⁶

²² See, for example: Babchishin, Hanson & VanZuylen, 2015; Elliot, Beech, Mandeville-Norden, 2013; Lee, Li, Lamade, Schuler & Prentky, 2012; Merdian et al., 2016; Webb et al., 2007.

²³ Faust, Bickart, Renaud & Camp, 2015

²⁴ Eke, Seto & Williams, 2011

²⁵ Eke, Seto & Williams, 2011

²⁶ Goller et al., 2016

7.2 Is there evidence of a sexual interest in children?

If item 5.2 is **Yes**, then this item (7.2) should also be **Yes**.

Sexual interest in children is a motivator for sexual offending that involves children, whether IIOC, contact or both.

Research has found that sexual interest in children is a risk factor for both internet and contact sexual offending.²⁷ There is evidence that levels of paedophilia are greater in IIOC only offenders than contact only offenders, and are greatest in dual offenders.²⁸

The notes field can be used to record anything else which is judged to be particularly relevant or salient in the context of antisocial orientation &/or sexual interest in children that isn't otherwise captured.

This section presents a decision matrix to inform recommendations based on the individual's antisocial orientation and sexual interest in children:

	Lower antisocial orientation	Higher antisocial orientation
No evident sexual interest in children	Proceed to routine administration and monitoring	Further assessment is indicated to inform monitoring / intervention targets
Evidence of having sexual interest in children	Further assessment is indicated to inform monitoring / intervention targets	Full assessment of risk of serious harm is indicated to inform risk management

7.3 On the basis of the above is supervision / intervention required to reduce the likelihood of reoffending?

Consider the proportionate and appropriate risk management response in relation to the assessed, nature, seriousness and likelihood of further offending. This is likely to involve supervision/intervention unless the individual presents with a lower antisocial orientation and lower sexual interest in children whereby monitoring or an alternative community disposal may be sufficient.

7.4 Are there any current concerns about the safety of a child/children or others that would indicate that intervention or further assessment is necessary?

If **Yes**, any concerns in this regard should be actioned as a matter of priority.

7.5 Are there issues relating to the vulnerability of the individual that should be highlighted?

This section allows the assessor to indicate if there are any concerns around the vulnerability of the individual. These may include, but not be limited to:

- Threats of harm from others
- Self-harm or suicide
- Mental health
- Substance-related issues
- Cognition, learning or understanding
- Other clinical, social or wellbeing concerns

²⁷ Seto et al., 2011

²⁸ McCarthy, 2010; Babchishin et al., 2015

7.6 Is a community disposal feasible?

Based on the assessed, nature, seriousness and likelihood of further offending, indicate whether a community disposal is suitable. Alternatively, it may be that further, more in-depth, assessment is indicated before deciding whether a community based disposal is feasible at this time.

If **Yes**, indicate which would be the most constructive by selecting one from:

- Admonition
- Deferred Sentence
- Drug Treatment/Testing Order
- Fine/Compensation Order
- Structured Deferred Sentence
- Other (where other is selected, specify what, such as a mental health disposal).
- Community Payback Order (where CPO is selected also select any requirements that may be appropriate based upon the assessed risks/ needs).

SECTION 8: CONCLUSION

Conclude the assessment by considering appropriate future action. The following is provided as a guide:

- Where there are indications of lower antisocial orientation and sexual interest in children then routine monitoring is likely to be a sufficient and proportionate response for the individual to promote desistance. As such the recommendation may be limited measures as the minimum necessary intervention and/or monitoring is sufficient.
- Where there are indications of either a higher antisocial orientation and/or sexual interest in children then further assessment may be warranted to better understand this and to inform management planning decisions. This suggests that heightened measures are necessary to effectively manage the identified risk/s. This may be supervision with further assessment to examine risk more fully in order to inform intervention targets.
- Where there are indications of both higher antisocial orientation and sexual interest in children then it may be considered that more intensive measures are required to effectively manage risk. As such, there are sufficient enough concerns regarding indicators of risk of serious harm to conduct a full analysis of risk of serious harm and consider if an active and alert multi-agency response to risk if required.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Routledge.
- Babchishin, K. M., Hanson, R. K., & VanZuylen, H. (2015). Online child pornography offenders are different: A meta-analysis of the characteristics of online and offline sex offenders against children. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 44(1), 45-66.
- Eke, A. W., Helmus, M., & Seto, M. C. (2018). Scoring Guide for the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT): Version 2. Available online - CPORTGuideV2EkeHelmusSeto20June2018 (3).pdf
- Eke, A. W., Seto, M. C., & Williams, J. (2011). Examining the criminal history and future offending of child pornography offenders: An extended prospective follow-up study. *Law and human behavior*, 35(6), 466.
- Elliott, I. A., Beech, A. R., & Mandeville-Norden, R. (2013). The psychological profiles of Internet, contact, and mixed Internet/contact sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(1), 3-20.
- Faust, E., Bickart, W., Renaud, C., & Camp, S. (2015). Child pornography possessors and child contact sex offenders: a multilevel comparison of demographic characteristics and rates of recidivism. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 27(5), 460-478.
- Goller, A., Jones, R., Dittman, V., Taylor, P., & Graf, M. (2016). Criminal recidivism of illegal pornography offenders in the overall population – a national cohort study of 4612 offenders in Switzerland. *Advances in Applied Sociology*, 6, 48 – 56.
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 66(2), 348.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: a meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 73(6), 1154.
- Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1994). Age and the explanation of crime. *American journal of sociology*, 89(3), 552-584.
- Krone, T. (2004). Typology of online child pornography offending. Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice. Australian Government, Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved from: [A typology of online child pornography offending | Australian Institute of Criminology \(aic.gov.au\)](http://www.aic.gov.au)
- Lee, A. F., Li, N.-C., Lamade, R., Schuler, A., & Prentky, R. A. (2012). Predicting hands-on child sexual offenses among possessors of Internet child pornography. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 18(4), 644–672.
- McCarthy, J. A. (2010). Internet sexual activity: A comparison between contact and non-contact child pornography offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 16 (20), 181-195.
- McPhail, I. V., Hermann, C. A., & Fernandez, Y. M. (2014). Correlates of emotional congruence with children in sexual offenders against children: A test of theoretical models in an incarcerated sample. *Child abuse & neglect*, 38(2), 336-346

- McPhail, I. V., Hermann, C. A., & Nunes, K. L. (2013). Emotional congruence with children and sexual offending against children: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 81(4), 737.
- Merdian, H. L., Moghaddam, N., Boer, D. P., Wilson, N., Thakker, J., Curtis, C., & Dawson, D. (2016). Fantasy-driven versus contact-driven users of child sexual exploitation material offender classification and implications for their risk assessment. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research & Treatment*, 1-24.
- Quayle, E., & Taylor, M. (2003). Model of problematic Internet use in people with a sexual interest in children. *Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice*, (279), 1-6.
- Risk Management Authority. (2011). Framework for Risk Assessment, Management and Evaluation (FRAME). Paisley: RMA.
- Seto, M. C. & Eke, A. W. (2015). Predicting recidivism among adult male child pornography offenders: Development of the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT). *Law and Human Behavior*, 39 (4), 416- 429.
- Seto, M. C., & Eke, A. W. (2005). The criminal histories and later offending of child pornography offenders. *Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment*, 17(2), 201-210.
- Seto, M. C., & Eke, A. W. (2017). Correlates of admitted sexual interest in children among individuals convicted of child pornography offenses. *Law and Human Behavior*, 41(3), 305-313.
- Underhill, J., Wakeling, H. C., Mann, R. E., & Webster, S. D. (2008). Male sexual offenders' emotional openness with men and women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(9), 1156-1173
- Wakeling, H. C., Howard, P., & Barnett, G. (2011). Comparing the validity of the RM2000 scales and OGRS3 for predicting recidivism by Internet sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 23(1), 146-168.
- Webb, L., Craissati, J., & Keen, S. (2007). Characteristics of Internet child pornography offenders: A comparison with child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19, 449-465.

APPENDIX A: DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCES

Incident is defined as acts relating to the committing of an illegal act or the breaking of a rule.

Non-violent / non-sexual offending are illegal acts or rule breaking not classified as violent or sexual contact offending as defined below.

Violent offending is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation.

Sexual contact offending is any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, or other act directed against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting. This is excluding those offences classified under IIOC or other definitions offered below.

IIOC (Possession) are offences relating to the indecent images of children (IIOC) or pseudo-photographs that involve possession. Possession involves both a physical and mental element. The physical element is that a person must have custody and control of the photographs in question. The mental element relates to the individual knowingly having custody and control of the photographs.

IIOC (Making / Distributing) are offences relating to the making or distribution of indecent images of children (IIOC) or pseudo-photographs. Making is classified as to take, or permit to be taken or to make. It is defined as "causing to exist, to produce by action, to bring about". There must be a deliberate and intentional act, done with the knowledge that the image is, or is likely to be, an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child. To make can include the following –

- Opening an attachment to an email containing an image
- Downloading an image from a website onto a computer screen
- Storing an image in a directory on a computer (this can also be a possession charge depending on where that image is stored)
- Accessing a pornographic website in which indecent images appeared by way of automatic "pop-up" mechanism.
- Live-streaming has been considered making IIOC.
- Distributing is classified as parting with possession of indecent images, or exposing or offering it for acquisition by, another person.

Online Communications, Solicitation, etc. are offences relating to online sexual behaviour towards a minor not otherwise specified in the definitions above. This includes engaging in sexual communications with a minor. Sexual communications is defined as being intentional with the purpose of either obtaining sexual gratification, and/or humiliating, distressing or alarming the victim. Communications can be sent by whatever means; a sexual written communication to or directs, by whatever means, a sexual verbal communication at a victim.

Solicitation of a minor involves asking or engaging in a conversation with a minor during the course of that conversation the individual asks (or solicits) the minor to meet them for the purpose of engaging in a sexual act. The method of contact must involve some type of online or electronic means with the conversation including a request for the minor to meet in order to engage in sexual activity.

Other (e.g. indecent exposure, voyeurism, etc.) should be used to classify offences not otherwise defined above. For example:

- Indecent exposure is the deliberate exposure in public or in view of the general public by a person of a portion or portions of their body in circumstances where the exposure is contrary to local moral or other standards of appropriate behaviour.
- Coercing a child to look at a sexual image
- Voyeurism involves the purpose of obtaining sexual gratification or humiliating, distressing or alarming another. It also involves a lack of consent or reasonable belief of consent. Acts include:
 - Private acts;
 - Operating equipment with intention of enabling others to observe a private act;
 - Records another doing a private act with intention of looking at that act, operates equipment beneath another's clothing to observe genitals or buttocks (whether exposed or covered with underwear) or the underwear covering the individual's genitals or buttocks, in circumstances where the genitals, buttocks or underwear would not otherwise be visible;
 - Records any of the above with the intention of looking at the image;
 - Installing equipment or constructing or adapting a structure or part of a structure, with the intention of committing one of the above acts.

Version	Date	Description of Changes	Author