

Name of Tool	Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT)
Category	Sexual Offending (Awaiting Validation)
Author / Publisher	Seto and Eke
Year	2015

Description

- The CPORT is a risk assessment tool designed to predict any sexual recidivism for men convicted of child pornography offences.
- It consists of 7 items: age at time of investigation, any prior criminal history, any contact sexual offending, any failure on conditional release, indicators of sexual interest in child pornography material or prepubescent or pubescent children, more boy than girl content in child pornography and more boy than girl content in other child depictions. If present, each item is worth one point.
- It is recommended that the CASIC scale developed by the authors to assess paedhebephilia (sexual interest in children) is used in conjunction with the CPORT tool.

Age Appropriateness

18+

Assessor Qualifications

The CPORT guide details the following requirements for those intending to use the tool: "Individuals accessing this document are expected to be experienced and current in the field of risk assessment and sexual offending, including child pornography offending, in order to make informed decisions regarding how the information herein may be relevant to their professional practice" ([Eke, Helmus and Seto, 2018](#)).

Tool Development

- It was developed from a sample of 286 adult men convicted of a least one child pornography offences using information available in Canadian police files, meaning that other criminogenic factors could not be examined. The legal definition for child pornography in Canada was used, where images of nude or partially dressed children are not illegal if there is no sexual activity and/or focus on the genital and anal regions ([Eke and Seto, 2016](#)).
- The development study found the CPORT had acceptable predictive accuracy for any sexual recidivism (AUC=.74) and contact sexual recidivism (AUC=.74). The CPORT was found to significantly predict sexual recidivism for internet offenders with other types of offending (bar contact offences) (AUC=.69) and those with histories of contact offending (AUC=.80); although it did not significantly predict sexual recidivism for those with only internet offences ([Seto and Eke, 2015](#)).
- The development samples were amalgamated with a new sample of 80 individuals with internet offences to give an overall sample of 346 men with internet offences. Any sexual recidivism for the

entire sample was an acceptable level at .724. This sample was then divided by those who committed only internet offences and those who had also committed contact offences. Predictive accuracy was found to be moderate at .685 for those who had committed internet offences and .767 for individuals with contact and internet offences ([Eke, Helmus and Seto, 2018](#)).

- A study looking at the convergent validity of CPORT with the VRS:SO found moderate positive correlations between the CPORT and VRS:SO criminality score. The CASIC scale was also found to have a moderate positive correlation with the VRS:SO sexual deviance score ([Maltais and Sribney, 2018](#)).
- A sample of 119 individuals convicted of child pornography offences were scored with the CPORT. CPORT scores are significantly higher for offenders with contact sexual offences and although the likelihood of child pornography reoffending is low, the odds increase with higher scores on the CPORT ([Gunnarsdóttir, 2019](#)).

General Notes

- Further updates on the CPORT, including a regularly revised 'Frequently Asked Questions' section, are available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Child-Pornography-Offender-Risk-Tool-CPORT>
- The CPORT can be used with any man who has committed an internet offence. This includes men who have committed internet offences alongside other types of sexual offences (e.g. contact offence against a child). It can be used alongside other risk assessment tools meant to assess sexual recidivism.
- A limitation of the tool is that the admission or diagnosis of paedophilia or hebephilia is vulnerable to self-reporting bias. To negate this risk, [Seto and Eke \(2017\)](#) developed the CASIC scale to assess 'paedophebephilia' (sexual interest in prepubescent and pubescent children respectively) This scale consists of six items looking at factors like marital status, collection and nature of context, access to children and engaging in online communications with children. Testing the scale on the sample of males from the developmental study resulted in an acceptable AUC of .71. further testing on a small cross-validation sample of 60 individuals with internet offences showed excellent predictive accuracy with an AUC of .81. The authors recommended that the CASIC measure may replace item 5 of the CPORT if a score of 3 or more is generated ([Seto and Eke, 2017](#)).
- A modified version of the CPORT (CPORT-M) was developed, consisting of five items: age, prior criminal history, any contact sexual offending, any failure on conditional release and any indication (and/or admission) or paedophilic or hebephiliac interests. The CPORT-M was found to have moderate predictive accuracy of general recidivism amongst individuals with child pornography offences (AUC=.68); although the sexual recidivism rates were too low to correlate with risk ([Pilon, 2016](#)).
- As indicated in personal communications in 2017, Seto and Eke gauged there is interest in validating the CPORT in the United States, Australia and criminal justice agencies throughout Canada. In another email update in 2017, Eke shared that there are a few groups currently conducting or planning to conduct validation work with the instrument: for instance, Ontario's probation and parole.
- The authors advise evaluators use caution when reporting CPORT scores, given the unknown stability of the recidivism estimates. It is also recommended that the tool is not used if more than one item is missing ([Eke and Seto, 2016](#)).
- The CPORT had not been evaluated with females or juveniles; thus is not recommended for use in these populations ([Eke and Seto, 2016](#)).
- At the present time, there has been no empirical assessment of the use of CPORT with individuals who have been charged and are still involved in criminal proceedings. If an assessor decides to use

CPORT prior to conviction for the purposes of sharing information about risk factors, the authors highly recommend that a caveat is added in about there being no empirical support for this. The authors caution against using CPORT in cases where the individual's charge for child pornography offences has already been withdrawn or dismissed – there is currently no empirical evidence for using the CPORT in this population ([Eke, Maaïke Helmus and Seto, 2018](#)).

- The CPORT is free and publicly available.