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Introduction

Professional and regulated volunteering should be distinguished from voluntourism\(^1\), a phenomenon which has evolved in recent years around products offered through the travel market usually aimed at unskilled volunteers who pay companies, small scale NGOs or other entities for opportunities to travel and work in distant communities as an attractive alternative to mass tourism. Although these volunteers (often described as ‘voluntourists’) may have good intentions, such trips may negatively affect the well-being of children, with certain forms of voluntourism posing additional risks to their safety by providing avenues for offenders to groom, access, and sexually exploit children.

\(^1\) Voluntourism or volunteer tourism is organized and packaged tourist trips with a duration of a few hours to a year in which the main purpose is to volunteer. It revolves around products offered through travel and tourism markets usually for unskilled volunteers, with no supervision and no criminal background checks required as an alternative to mass tourism. The Code Voluntourism Policy.
Background information and context

The Netherlands was selected for this case study as a sending country for volunteers that has recognized the risks to children related to this form of tourism and has taken steps to introduce regulations. This case study reflects information gathered through desk research as well as through online interviews conducted by Defence for Children – ECPAT The Netherlands with eight selected key informants and two written responses (see list of interviewees in Appendix 1). The case study has been prepared to showcase examples of actionable frameworks to regulate child related voluntourism (with focus on orphanages) by governments and businesses from the perspective of sending countries.

This case study is complementary to the recommendations from the report of the UN Special Rapporteur on the sale, sexual exploitation and sexual abuse of children - *A study on the exploitation and sexual abuse of children in the context of travel and tourism; a closer look at the phenomena of voluntourism*[^1] that will be presented to the UN General Assembly in October 2023, as well as the report of the UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence Against Children on Child Protection in Travel and Tourism.

Introduction and background to the Dutch context

In the Netherlands, small civil society organizations, known as ‘particuliere initiatieven’ (private development initiatives) are by far the biggest category of providers of volunteer travel opportunities to residential care facilities for children in low and middle-income countries. A private initiative is often set up after a person visited a country where children are in need of help and the person started an orphanage for these children. Data from the Private Development Initiatives database of Radboud University estimates that in 2020, between 1,430 and 1,730 Dutch organizations sent volunteers on such trips to residential care facilities in low and middle-income countries. These range from individual volunteers to groups, privately sponsored by schools or churches. It is impossible to determine exactly how many volunteers are involved, partly because there is very little scrutiny of these initiatives, and the numbers of volunteers can fluctuate considerably from year to year.3

The number of volunteers in orphanages seems to have decreased in the past decade, probably due to critical discussions and increased awareness of the negative effects of this form of tourism. While currently there are no eligibility requirements from the government concerning voluntourism, it is looking into the possibility of introducing regulations as a result of a study commissioned by the government in 2020. The Netherlands has legal instruments or measures available to prevent convicted transnational child sexual offenders from travelling abroad, but a study4 into these instruments concluded that these are not often used.5

---


5 To see how Extraterritoriality and Extradition Provisions Allow for Effective Prosecution of Sexual Exploitation of Children globally consult ECPAT Global Progress Indicators at: https://ecpat.org/our-impact/?i=extraterritoriality-extradition#map
Collaborative action in the Netherlands

In 2007 **Better Care Network Netherlands** (BCNN) was established and has worked extensively on the topic of orphanage voluntourism for over twelve years. The BCNN is a network of child rights organizations that share their knowledge, experience and networks to improve the quality of alternative care for children without adequate parental care in low- and middle-income countries by improving the implementation of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children. BCNN organizes campaigns, lobbies for better regulations, and provides training and advice on responsible alternative care for children without parental care. Defence for Children - ECPAT Netherlands is the chair of BCNN.

In 2015 **Volunteer Correct Foundation** introduced a transparency-index (issued in 2016 and 2017). The index shows how 66 volunteer-sending organizations in the Netherlands communicated online to future volunteers about their 'Goal & Mission', ‘Visibility & Responsiveness’, ‘Administration & Finance’, ‘Partners & Projects’ and ‘Promotion & Guidance’. After that, Volunteer Correct decided to work together with the volunteer-sending organizations to professionalise the sector. At the end of 2018, the Volunteer Correct Association was founded through cooperation between the Volunteer Correct Foundation and 15 volunteer organizations. They developed **quality guidelines** for volunteer work, which included the criteria that “member organizations do not offer projects/assignments to volunteers in children’s homes. The projects/assignments that involve working with children are aimed at children who still live at home.” Unfortunately, due to the Covid pandemic, the association was put on hold and has not continued their activities since then. A lack of governmental support for the initiative was said to be a contributing factor to this.
**Partin** is the Dutch sector organization for private initiatives active in international cooperation. Partin supports and guides private initiatives through mutual exchange, sharing of information, knowledge and advice, and advocacy. Their website provides a toolkit for its members, which includes the 'care for vulnerable children' and 'child protection policy', developed by BCNN.
Key milestones since 2017

1. In 2017 BCNN launched the campaign ‘Stop weeshuistoerisme’ (‘Stop orphanage tourism’) to raise awareness about the negative effects of orphanage tourism with a call to action to stop orphanage volunteering abroad. The campaign attracted wide media attention, reaching a large audience through its website and social media. It won an award for best campaign for a good cause.

2. In 2018 a member of the largest political party in the Netherlands (VVD) commissioned a white paper, followed by a roundtable for members of the Parliament for which BCNN, Defence for Children – ECPAT NL, UNICEF and academic experts developed position papers.

3. In 2018 BCNN launched a second campaign ‘Stop weeshuisstages’ (‘Stop orphanage internships’) to raise awareness amongst students and universities about the negative effects of internships in orphanages and called on them to stop this practice. A university pledge was developed where universities for applied science commit to stop offering such internships abroad. The pledge has so far been signed by three universities.

4. In 2019 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs commissioned a study to determine the extent of orphanage tourism from the Netherlands, what actors are involved and/or responsible, and what actions the government can take.

5. In 2019 twelve Dutch private development organizations signed the #EveryChildAFamily pledge. The pledge is an initiative of three Dutch foundations: Stichting Peramiho (Tanzania), Friendship Foundation (Sri Lanka) and Stahili Foundation (Kenya) in collaboration with BCNN.

---

6 van Haga, W., Een goede bedoeling is niet altijd een goed idee: een voorstel tot bestrijding van weeshuistoerisme, Initiatiefnota, Reference number 35069, nr. 2, Date 07-11-2018.

The supporting organizations pledge to support children growing up in families rather than in institutions. They call on other NGOs, companies, churches and schools to invest in family-oriented care. Over 65 foundations have signed the pledge.

6. In 2020 a motion on a general duty of care for companies in accordance with the OECD guidelines was passed in the House of Representatives.

7. In 2022 BCNN launched a third campaign ‘Wees Wijs’ (‘Be wise’), specifically targeted at faith-based volunteers and proposing alternatives to orphanage volunteering. This resulted in wide media attention around the negative effects of volunteering in orphanages.
Achievements to date

- The Department of Foreign Affairs has updated foreign travel advice, discouraging volunteers from engaging in orphanage tourism in 21 countries.

- The Dutch Policy for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation is working to address the underlying root causes of orphanage voluntourism. Relevant elements of the Foreign Trade and Development Policy include poverty reduction, food security, sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR), security and rule of law.

- Orphanage tourism has become a separate portfolio under the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to coordinate the actions of different ministries (e.g. issuance of Certificates of Conduct by the Ministry of Justice, certification of non-profit organizations by the Ministry of Finance, prevention of orphanage internships and oversight of sponsorship actions by schools by the Ministry of Education).

- Many commercial travel companies in the Netherlands are aware of the negative consequences and stopped offering volunteer trips or internships to orphanages and ask for a Certificate of Conduct when volunteers work with children.

- Over 65 private initiatives and three universities have signed a pledge to stop offering volunteers trips or internships to orphanages.

- BCNN’s three awareness-raising campaigns targeted towards volunteers resulted in extensive media attention and an increase in public debate and awareness of the issue of orphanage volunteering. The government is planning to initiate its own awareness-raising campaign targeted toward young people and their parents.
Trends observed by the interviewed experts

• **No major changes after Covid-19 pandemic.** After the cessation of travel during the pandemic, trips for Dutch volunteers to orphanages continued. The trips seem to have been delayed, rather than cancelled. Alternatives to orphanages/residential care facilities in receiving countries (some of which were empty during the pandemic) have largely not been implemented. However, some countries, for example Kenya, have recently introduced care reform programs which are seeing a gradual transition from institutional to family-based care.

• **The tourism aspect** has become more important. There is less emphasis on intercultural exchange and less attention on sustainability. Wanting to ‘do good’ is increasingly combined with fun (holidays). Commercial providers are responding to this trend.

• **Terminology is being adjusted.** Instead of ‘orphanage’ the term ‘boarding school’ is increasingly used. Vague terms and descriptions are being used, possibly in an attempt to whitewash orphanage tourism.

• **Commercial volunteer-sending companies** are more likely to offer volunteer trips involving day care, after school care, extra-curricular activities, support to teachers, rather than trips involving orphanages. Unqualified volunteers are still being sent. Certificates of Conduct are increasingly being requested, however many companies lack a proper child protection policy.
• **Private development initiatives** often believe that ‘their’ orphanage/residential care facility is good and needed. They are often continuing the same way of working for years, making it difficult to change. The group of private development initiatives is fragmented and difficult to reach through formal knowledge channels. Private development initiatives form the largest category of providers of volunteer travel opportunities to residential care facilities for children.

• **Faith-based organizations** regularly support and promote missions to orphanages abroad. The sector is often informal and more difficult to access.

• **Increased awareness** of the negative effects of orphanage tourism due to awareness-raising campaigns and media attention. Its image has changed from 'doing good' to 'better not'. However, still a number of public figures and celebrities in the Netherlands support or promote residential care institutions in low and middle-income countries, continuing to build support for this form of care for children.
Measures to prevent child sexual abuse in the context of voluntourism

An exploratory study commissioned by the Ministry of Justice and Security on the subject of (convicted) offenders of transnational child sexual abuse, described different types of offenders. The ‘voluntourist’ can be a perpetrator who volunteers for organizations that work with vulnerable children. This type of perpetrator – also referred to in the literature as the ‘benefactor’ – abuses children by gaining access to them through a charitable or other social institution. Children in an institutionalized environment are usually vulnerable to all kinds of violence and abuse. Organizations do not always request references or a Certificate of Conduct from volunteers nor supervise their work, partly because of the unequal power relationship between the ‘wealthy’ volunteer and the generally less affluent host community. This allows repeat offenders to gain access to vulnerable minors. The research on orphanage tourism by Slot et al. (2020) reports the same problem. In 2013 police figures showed that in 13 of the 85 convictions of Dutch perpetrators of transnational child sexual abuse, access to minors was obtained through a residential institution (see appendix 2 for case examples).

The Netherlands has in place measures to prevent convicted child sex offenders from volunteering in some cases, such as the Certificate of Conduct (in Dutch: ‘Verklaring Omtrent Gedrag’ or ‘VOG’). Persons who want to work with children in the Netherlands are in many cases obliged to submit a Certificate of Conduct to their new employer, and in cases where there is no legal obligation, employers can still ask for this document in case they find this appropriate. The VOG is a statement that shows that someone’s criminal history is not an obstacle to work with a specific

---

target group. Normally, a retrospective period of four years applies to the assessment of VOG applications. In the case of sexual offences, an unlimited review period applies. If a person with another EU nationality applies for a VOG to work with children in the Netherlands, during the VOG assessment the criminal record is also requested from the applicant’s home country, using the European Criminal Record Information System (ECRIS). Unfortunately, there are currently no agreements on sharing irrevocable convictions for preventive purposes such as the VOG screening with countries outside Europe. The Ministry of Justice and Security therefore continues to focus on making EU-wide agreements for data sharing with countries outside the EU that also meet the legal standards that apply in the EU. In addition, there are current initiatives to determine if it is possible and desirable to include a legal basis for an exchange of judicial data for preventive purposes (such as the VOG) in case new international bilateral mutual legal assistance treaties are drawn up or when existing international treaties are amended.

The Dutch Passport Act (‘Paspoortwet’) makes it possible to refuse or to revoke a passport in certain cases where there is a reasonable suspicion that someone will abscond from legal prosecution or from enforcement of an imposed judicial sentence or where there is a reasonable suspicion that someone will commit a similar criminal offence abroad for which they have been irrevocably convicted in the past ten years. The provisions in the Dutch Passport Act are not aimed specifically at sex offenders but can apply to them. Refusing or revoking a passport could prevent a child sex offender from travelling abroad and getting access to vulnerable children.

Research into the legal instruments shows that the Passport Act is not often used. In the study commissioned by the Ministry of Justice and Security9 it is stated that there is a lack of a clear policy framework regarding the Passport Act. There is still no agreement about which

---

criteria should apply and how those criteria should be established to arrive at a substantiated, well-founded suspicion of the risk of recidivism or whether the offender wishes to evade his or her sentence. In addition, though a qualitatively good risk assessment is a crucial condition for the application of the Act, the risk assessments are not always carried out or are not carried out by organisations or persons that are adequately equipped for this, according to the study. Furthermore, experts note that the applicability of the current risk assessment tool (Static-99R) to the target group of transnational child sexual offenders is possibly limited. Therefore, the Ministry of Justice and Security has asked the Scientific Research and Documentation Centre (‘Wetenschappelijk Onderzoeks-en Documentatiecentrum’ or ‘WODC’) to investigate the profile and the modus operandi of perpetrators of transnational child sexual abuse and to what extent the existing risk assessment tool is appropriate for this specific type of offender, as well as the bottlenecks in the application of the risk assessment tool in practice. This study is expected to be completed before the summer of 2024.

Finally, the Dutch police use the Interpol warning messages, Green Notices, with brief information about persons who have been convicted in the Netherlands of serious sexual offences and who are known to have an increased risk of recidivism. Police send a Green Notice to Interpol for inclusion in their database, after which it is sent to all Interpol-affiliated countries. Member countries that receive the warning information can consequently take measures based on their own laws and regulations. When a Green Notice is sent by the police to Interpol, the person concerned also receives a notification. This can therefore prevent the person concerned from actually travelling abroad and committing new sexual offences. In practice, according to the study commissioned by the Ministry of Justice and Security, fewer than ten Green Notices have been used because of the possible infringement of privacy, insufficient

---

knowledge of operational services abroad about the use of the warning messages, and the possible freedom-restricting consequences of the Notices. Before a Green Notice can be given, a high risk of recidivism must be revealed through a risk assessment. As mentioned above, the existing risk assessment tool is possibly not yet equipped to measure the risk for transnational child sexual abuse.11 The research requested by the Ministry of Justice and Security is expected to provide more clarity.

Another measure that is not (yet) applied in the Netherlands is an obligation for every convicted perpetrator of sexual offences to register in a registry after having served the sentence imposed. Registries have been established in a number of countries to allow governments to keep track of persons convicted of child sexual offences through various notification systems and data stored in the registry and potentially shared among different entities and authorities in an attempt to allow for better collaboration and safeguarding of children. The Minister of Justice and Security of the Netherlands has committed to consult with the relevant organizations regarding the possible added value of this registration obligation, compared to the existing supervisory measures for offenders of child sexual abuse that already are in place in the Netherlands.12

As part of a comprehensive approach, the Netherlands also focuses on helplines and treatment programs, such as ‘Stop it Now’ to support potential offenders in managing their behaviours.

---


Gaps observed by the interviewed experts

- The Dutch Government promotes **self-regulation of the volunteer travel and volunteer-sending sector**, but does not structurally provide financial support. Until now, self-regulation of the sector has failed.

- There are **no eligibility child protection requirements** from the Dutch government when setting up a private initiative nor for sending volunteers abroad.

- There are no specific child protection requirements related to **charity status** when working with children.

- There are no specific child protection requirements for registration of child-focused foundations at the **Chamber of Commerce**.

- There is no obligatory **Certificate of Conduct** to work with children abroad.

- There is a lack of awareness of **global citizenship**, including the potential negative consequences of neocolonial and white saviour attitudes on children in destination countries.

- There is a lack of insight into **funding streams** supporting orphanages directly/indirectly. There is no regulation or monitoring of the value chain of donations.

- Legal instruments or measures available to prevent **convicted child sexual offenders** from travelling abroad are not often used.
Key learnings

- **Continued attention** is needed to inform orphanage volunteers about the negative consequences and convince policymakers of the importance of the subject. Due to awareness-raising campaigns, media attention and lobby activities of organizations such as BCNN, a white paper on orphanage volunteering has been commissioned by a Dutch political party, research has been commissioned by the government, public awareness and debate on the issue has grown, and regulatory and structural changes are being discussed.

- **Data** is needed to formulate an appropriate response. The research commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the Ministry of Justice and Security gave insights into the prevalence of orphanage volunteering, as well as, stakeholders, gaps and opportunities.

- **Private development initiatives** form the biggest category of Dutch providers of volunteer travel opportunities to residential care facilities for children.

- **Self-regulation** of the sector is ineffective because it is fragmented, there is a lack of financial support for effective leadership, and there is a firm and enduring belief that the orphanages/residential care facilities are needed and acceptable means of caring for children without parental care.

- **Despite high standards** for (employees of) institutions that offer accommodation, care, and education of children in the Netherlands, Dutch people who (voluntarily) work with children abroad do so largely unregulated. The Dutch government has no jurisdiction in countries where orphanage tourism occurs; orphanages and volunteers in other countries must follow local regulations. However, the government could regulate providers established in the Netherlands.

- **Awareness raising** is necessary among young people. There is a need to give stronger attention to global citizenship in the school curriculum, to end neocolonialism and white saviourism.

- **Be aware of whitewashing**: different terminology may be used, but in reality, it is the same residential childcare facilities.
Next steps for the Netherlands

- **Continue lobby and advocacy** to improve child protection regulations concerning voluntourism (e.g. requirements for charity status and Chamber of Commerce registration, obligatory Certificate of Conduct, global citizenship in the school curriculum, use of legal options to prevent convicted child sex offenders from travelling abroad).

- **Continue to inform and educate volunteers and parents** so they can influence the volunteer travel market by choosing responsible ways of combining travelling and volunteering.

- **Continue to engage with volunteer-sending organizations** (focus on private initiatives) that are facilitating international voluntourism.

- **Continue collaboration** with all stakeholders in network meetings and working groups.
Global call to action

Governments should:

- **Address underlying root causes.** Strengthen child protection systems and invest in family-based care in volunteer receiving countries.
- **Regulate and monitor voluntourism** to ensure that volunteer-sending organizations and tour operators who offer programs implement child protection measures.
- **Include targeted policy measures**, such as: measures relating to an organization’s charity status; attaching conditions to registration with the Chamber of Commerce; measures requiring volunteers to have a Certificate of Conduct; a quality mark for volunteer travel providers. These measures also apply to volunteer travel to projects involving children in a broader sense.
- **Include global citizenship**, neocolonialism, white saviorism, and rights based approaches in school curricula.
- **Prohibit direct or indirect funding** to programs, initiatives or organizations involved with orphanages. Review relevant accreditation/funding/contracting policies to make them conditional on adherence to standards and guidelines.
- **Actively promote implementation** of the UN Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children, and invest in de-institutionalization and the reform of care systems to promote family-based alternative care, and child safeguarding solutions.
- **Support the EU corporate sustainability due diligence directive** that requires companies to conduct due diligence on, and take responsibility for, human rights abuses and environmental harm throughout their global value chains.
- **Accede to the Framework Convention on Tourism Ethics.** Harmonise national legislations to promote responsible and ethical tourism, including through regulating voluntourism in both sending and receiving countries.
• **Establish and enforce extraterritoriality provisions** for all crimes related to the sexual exploitation of children, including those occurring in online environments, and in the context of voluntourism activities organized with or for children.

• **Set up workable and clear criteria for legal options** (such as the Passport Act) when they can be put in practice to prevent transnational child sex offenders from travelling abroad.

• **Set up bilateral agreements** with high-risk countries to enable the exchange of information about convictions of child sex offenders on an ad hoc basis.

• **Use data to inform whole-of-government approaches** and monitor the implementation and effectiveness of strategies.

**Businesses should:**

• **Implement child safeguarding standards** and a minimum threshold for qualification, skills, and experience required for any work with or for children. Companies need to stop offering visits to orphanages and residential care centres as part of travel packages and redirect tourists to solutions that meaningfully help children. All organisations and companies should create and follow safeguarding policies for work involving children and comply with international standards.

**Private initiatives should:**

• **Sign the pledge** and other commitments to ending orphanage volunteering and promoting family-based care.

• **Take part in discussions** about how to transition from supporting a residential care institution to supporting family and community based care.

• **Engage critically** in own practice (possibly profit-driven) and with local partners.

• **Invest in family-based care solutions.**
## APPENDIX 1
**LIST OF INTERVIEWEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Niko Winkel</td>
<td>Founder of Volunteer Correct</td>
<td>Branch organization</td>
<td>7-7-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Cheney</td>
<td>Member of the <em>Transforming Children’s Care</em> Global Collaborative + Professor, University of Victoria, Canada (worked in NL for many years)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>7-7-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Nieuwenhuizen + Rob Oliver</td>
<td>Better Care Network Netherlands</td>
<td>Network organization</td>
<td>8-7-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Kinsbergen</td>
<td>Radboud University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>10-7-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy advisors</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>17-7-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Oliel</td>
<td>Stahili Foundation</td>
<td>Private development Initiative</td>
<td>8-7-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Kuijpers-Heezemans</td>
<td>Radboud University</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>18-8-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy advisors</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice and Security</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Written input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Monster</td>
<td>National Police, Child Sexual Exploitation Team</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Written input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1
CASE EXAMPLES

Examples of convictions\(^\text{13}\) and arrests\(^\text{14}\) concerning transnational child sexual abuse in orphanages:

- In 2023 an orphanage was closed in Suriname, due to suspicions of sexual abuse of the children in the facility by the orphanage director and an employee. The board of the orphanage was partly Dutch and supported with Dutch funding.

- In 2018 a Dutch man was arrested in Kenya because he was suspected of committing indecent acts with three boys in his orphanage.

- In 2018 a 70-year-old Dutch man was sentenced to life imprisonment in the Philippines. In 2006, he had already been sentenced in the Netherlands to a prison term of 54 months for committing indecent acts with minors with a disability in Amsterdam. He was prevented from starting a day care facility by the mayor of Amsterdam. After that he went to the Philippines, where he registered at a nursery. He also placed a personal ad asking for a young woman, preferably with children, to start an orphanage with him.

- In 2017 a Dutch man was sentenced to five years in prison in Cambodia for the sexual abuse of children. He was already convicted of sexual abuse in the Netherlands and left for Cambodia in 2007 after serving his sentence. In 2009, he set up a children’s home in Siem Reap, where he abused children.

- A Dutch man who lived in the Philippines in 2009, 2011 and 2012 was involved in the care of children that lived on the streets. The Dutch social worker was suspected of sexually abusing a Filipino minor girl while under his care. He was sentenced in the Netherlands to a six-month suspended prison sentence with a probationary period of five years and community service of 120 hours.

- In 2014 a 46-year-old Dutch man was sentenced to four years in prison for child abuse in Bulgaria. At the time of his arrest, two children from a neighbouring children’s home were with him in a hotel room. It was suspected that he wanted to make child sexual abuse imagery with the children. In 2011 he had already been sentenced to 2.5 years in prison in the Netherlands. He was released in November 2012. In the late 1990s he already abused his niece and two boys. He is also said to have incited a 14-year-old girl to take part in sexual acts in front of a webcam.

\(^{13}\) https://defenceforchildren.nl/wat-doen-we/themas/seksuele-uitbuiting/wetgeving/veroordelingen/
\(^{14}\) https://www.parool.nl/wereld/politie-ontruimt-kindertehuis-in-suriname-vanwege-misstanden-b160864a/
• In 2013 an Indonesian court sentenced a 55-year-old Dutch man to four years in prison for abusing four girls in Bali. He was arrested in the Buleleng district, because he allegedly paid girls between the ages of nine and twelve approximately one dollar in exchange for sex. The man was a board member of the Support Children Indonesia Foundation.

• In 2012 a 60-year-old Dutch man was sentenced to a community service order of 240 hours and a suspended prison sentence of 15 months for the abuse of six children in Bangladesh. Between 2001 and 2005 he worked in a shelter for underage (handicapped) boys that he set up himself. The court only imposed 240 hours of community service because the suspect had waited beyond the reasonable term for conviction.

• In 2011 a 58-year-old Dutch man was sentenced to ten years in prison in southeastern India for kidnapping, child abuse and producing images of child sexual abuse. He had been in India since 1980 and ran an orphanage on the outskirts of Chennai where an investigation subsequently showed that he had abused more than 40 children in the orphanage. He had already been arrested in 2002, but was released on bail. The man died in prison in 2013.

• In 2011, a 65-year-old Dutch man was sentenced to eighteen months in prison in Cambodia for sexually abusing two underage boys. However, he was released after the verdict, as he had already been in pre-trial detention for almost ten months and the last eight months were converted into a suspended sentence. He had set up a shelter and an education program for poor children in Sihanoukville. Two boys in the shelter (eleven and twelve years old) reported him to the police after he touched their genitals.

• In 2009 a court in Kathmandu, Nepal, sentenced a 59-year-old Dutchman to nine years in prison for systematically abusing several children aged eleven and older in a children’s home he owned since 2003.