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Executive Summary

The Kathmandu context

The commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) is a well-known problem in Kathmandu, Nepal. In recent years there has been a proliferation of venues making up the adult entertainment sector (AES). These venues are where the sexual exploitation of young people is known to take place. The nature of this exploitation varies across venues, ranging from workers being made to flirt with customers to being forced to engage in intimate activities and sexual intercourse.

The Freedom Fund and its partners have been working in the Kathmandu Valley to address the issue of CSEC since mid-2015. The Freedom Fund’s approach has had three main areas of focus:

1) Supporting the minors involved and equipping them with the skills and knowledge needed to permanently leave the sector.
2) Strengthening government frameworks and impacting upon the broader systems that allow this form of exploitation to persist.
3) Reducing the demand for minors in the adult entertainment sector by deterring customers and employers from engaging minors.

Earlier prevalence estimates

Despite the seriousness of the issue, until now there has been limited evidence of the true scale of the problem. There have been several attempts to estimate the numbers of workers involved, yet these have varied widely. In 2009, an analysis by international non-governmental organisation (NGO) Terre des hommes estimated up to 13,000 women and girls working in the adult entertainment sector in Kathmandu. While a study conducted in 2008 by the Nepal Ministry of Women, Children & Social Welfare estimated 30,000 to 40,000 females working in the sector.

In terms of the proportion of workers who are minors, estimates also vary considerably. A 2008 study conducted by NGO Shakti Samuha estimated 33 percent were minors. However, an earlier study by the National Human Rights Commission Nepal (2004) put the figure at nearer 16 percent. Altogether, previous estimates seem to suggest there are anywhere from 1,760 to 13,200 minors working in the AES sector. It must also be highlighted that the majority of these estimations were conducted over 10 years ago, and were generated using small sample sizes and qualitative techniques.

Knowing the scale of the issue is crucial to permanently overcome the problem. Accurate estimates are required to understand both the scale and nature of CSEC in Kathmandu, and whether the problem is declining or increasing. Population estimates, with a reasonable degree of precision, allow change to be determined and enable those working on the exploitation of minors to understand whether their efforts are having the intended effect.

Current prevalence estimate

The City University of New York has been commissioned by the Freedom Fund to estimate the current prevalence of minors working in Kathmandu’s adult entertainment sector. The study has a sample size of 600 workers aged 21 and under and currently working in the adult entertainment sector. It uses two well-tested statistical methods for estimating the size of hidden populations: respondent-driven sampling (RDS), combined with a mark and recapture approach. The study also includes 50 in-depth interviews, which have generated deep insights into the nature of employment in AES. This study constitutes the most statistically rigorous study into the prevalence of minors working in the AES in the Kathmandu Valley to date. It also updates previous estimates now conducted almost 10 years ago.

This research has found that the current population of minors working in adult entertainment venues in the Kathmandu Valley is approximately 1,650 (with a margin of error of ±23). It has also been found that the proportion of minors working across the adult entertainment sector is significantly lower than in previous years. This suggests that efforts to combat CSEC in Kathmandu are having a positive impact.
sector as a whole is 17 percent. While the majority of workers - 62 percent - began working in the sector when they were under 18.

**The nature of exploitation**

This study has found that the adult entertainment sector is a highly sexually exploitative place for children to work. Among workers age 17 and under:

- Over 60 percent are working in sexually exploitative environments. The types of sexual exploitation youths are exposed to range from flirting and groping to being made to perform sensual massages and engaging in sexual intercourse.
- Six percent are exposed to the most severe forms of sexual exploitation. This includes being made to watch pornography and perform oral, vaginal or anal sex. This risk increases with age, the rate of severe sexual exploitation is 6 percent among workers age 15 - 17, compared to 9 percent among workers age 18 - 21.

Nearly all of the workers (99 percent) aged 17 and under working in the adult entertainment sector are considered to be working in the worst forms of child labour, according to the International Labour Organization convention.

Among these minors:

- Over one-quarter have been forced to drink alcohol or use drugs as part of their work in the sector, both illegal in Nepal.
- Twenty-seven percent are considered to be in situations of forced labour. The forms of coercion used are varied. They range from subtle methods such as threats to the worker’s family or not being able to leave the job because their home was too far away, to more severe forms of physical and sexual violence.

The research has also highlighted the range of emotional and physical abuse young workers are exposed to. Again, the forms vary, from blackmail and threats of violence against family members to beatings by managers for not doing as guests wanted. Abusive treatment was commonplace for many, either in the form of being shouted at and called bad names or being hit by guests and/or owners while at work. Overall, 72 percent experience some form of violence at work.

Sometimes when guests get drunk they tease us. They make you read dirty stories and if you don’t then they beat you. – 16-year-old girl, guest house (8092)

The owner says he will kill me if I leave. He says he will tell my family that I’ve been put to work in another place and kill and make me vanish. Guests have hit me many times. – 13-year-old girl, guest house (8035)

**Contextual changes**

Over the past few years, there have been a number of contextual changes in Nepal, several of these may have contributed to the reduction in the numbers of minors working in the adult entertainment sector. The Children’s Act (2075) was endorsed by the Government of Nepal in 2018, the Act prohibits the use of children in a number of sectors, including the entertainment business. In terms of law enforcement, there have been notable changes too. In the years since 2008, there has been increased pressure from civil society on local government and law enforcement to increase the number of venue inspections. A further contributing factor is the change in the overall youth unemployment rates in Nepal, as when youth unemployment is high it indicates few other economic opportunities for young people and hence, a push factor into the adult entertainment sector. Youth unemployment was at its highest level over the past decade in 2013 (5.44 percent), since then it has begun to decrease and in 2017 stood at 4.31 percent.

**Conclusion**

It may be that the numbers of minors working in the AES has declined since the earlier estimates. Regardless, there are still a significant number of minors working in the sector. A sector which has proven to be a very sexually exploitative and physically abusive, both for those aged 17 and below and those slightly older. While few other job opportunities exist for young people, girls, and to a lesser extent, boys, will continue to enter this exploitative sector. This research has provided a reliable estimate as to the prevalence of the issue and deep insight into the nature of work in AES. As a result of this research, a number of recommendations are provided, as to what can be done next to help those in AES and to continue to combat the issue as a whole.
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Background

In the 1990s, migration of girls and women from rural Nepal to Kathmandu began to increase. The reasons for this included conflict, displacement, the growth of the carpet industry and general poverty. The practice continues to be a recourse for individuals seeking to support their families, escape abuse or simply create a better future for themselves (Subedi, G., 2009).

Simultaneous to this development, the adult entertainment sector (AES) also began to flourish in the Kathmandu Valley. This now consists of venues such as dance bars, cabin restaurants, guesthouses and massage parlours. The process has required a major influx of girls and women to fill positions at these establishments. A 2010 situation analysis by the international non-governmental organisation (NGO) Terre des Hommes (Frederick, J. 2009) estimated that between 11,000 and 13,000 girls and women were working in the adult entertainment sector. Another study by the Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare, Government of Nepal (2008) put the figures even higher, at 30,000 to 40,000.

As it strives to meet the demands of customers and increase profits, the adult entertainment sector has become involved in commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking (Frederick, J., Basnyet, M. & Aguettant, J.L., 2010). Previous research has identified children under 18 as the most vulnerable, although estimates concerning the proportion of workers who are minors vary. Shakti Samuha (2008) estimated this to be 33 percent, whereas the National Human Rights Commission (2004) put the figure at 16 percent.

One study (Suwal & Amatya, 2002) conducted interviews with 440 females involved in street-based, restaurant and massage prostitution. It found that 18.7 percent were under 18 years old. Another study (Maiti Nepal, 2010) found that 15.7 percent of 299 women and girls working in cabin restaurants, dance bars, massage parlours and dohori restaurants were under 18. A more recent study has also indicated that many customers prefer younger girls, youth being considered an attractive quality.

Most customers were unsure of the real age of girls working in the venues. As long as there were no glaring signs, customers did not believe that they were being forced to engage in sex work, (Risal, S., Hacker, E. & Sutra, 2018). Many minors entered their positions as order-takers or servers, only to be sexually exploited or coerced into sex work later on (CWIN & ECPAT Luxembourg, 2015). Exploitative practices ranged from being coerced into flirting with and kissing customers to engaging in sexual intercourse. Workers also experienced verbal and physical abuse, rape, increased risk of sexually transmitted infections and being ostracised by their own community (Frederick, J., Basnyet, M. & Aguettant, J.L., 2010).

Despite the potential harm associated with such exploitation and sex trafficking, there is limited empirical research on the scale and scope of the issue in Nepal. Estimates to date have relied upon relatively small sample sizes and used qualitative methods. Furthermore, the hidden nature of human trafficking makes it difficult to apply conventional survey methods for generating prevalence estimates (Tyldum & Brunovskis, 2005). Establishing a sampling frame for probability-based sampling, fundamental to conventional survey research, is either impossible or prohibitively expensive.

Two alternative sampling strategies figure prominently for research on hard-to-reach populations: respondent-driven sampling and mark-recapture methods.

Respondent-driven sampling (RDS) is a well-known, network-based approach to recruiting and estimating the characteristics of a hidden population (Heckathorn, 1997, 2002). There is a large and growing body of literature that contributes to both inferential techniques and empirical applications, and the approach has the potential to provide efficient estimates of study population characteristics (Gile, 2011). However, one shortcoming of RDS is that the resulting tree-like structure of the networked sample does not observe overlaps between networks.
This prevents the method from generating estimates about population size in the way that a typical adaptive sampling design can (Frank & Snijders, 1994; Vincent & Thompson, 2017).

For this reason, a mark-recapture procedure (Schwarz and Seber, 1999), based on a combination of RDS and venue-based sampling, was also used. This allowed overlaps to be measured. Furthermore, the venue-based sample enabled individuals to be included who may otherwise have remained hidden. This hybrid strategy was considered most appropriate for producing cost-effective estimates of the high-risk population, on a broad scale.

**Study purpose and scope**

The commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking of minors into the AES has been identified as a serious and potentially growing problem. Research is needed to improve understanding and support for those impacted by the issue. This research aims to measure the prevalence of the exploitation of minors in the AES in Kathmandu, and further understand the context in which exploitation is taking place. The research does not include minors who engage in commercial sex work on the street, nor those exploited in informal settings such as private homes. Researchers sought to answer the following questions:

- What is the prevalence of exploitation of minors in the adult entertainment sector?
- What is the nature and intensity of exploitation in the different types of worksites?
- What tactics are being used to keep young people in their situation?
- Are there differences between minors and those over the age of 18?
- In what ways is the nature of commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking changing in Kathmandu?

To answer these questions effectively within the context of Nepal, researchers partnered with New ERA, a non-profit research organisation located in Kathmandu. Insights gained from this study can be promoted nationally to similar studies in different locations, thus helping determine the true number of minors experiencing exploitation and the context in which it is occurring. This information is vitally important for understanding the full extent of child sexual exploitation and trafficking in Nepal, as well as for developing appropriate solutions.
Methodology

The study consisted of the following phases:

• Protocol development and training field researchers.
• Data collection around the Kathmandu Valley.
• Data analysis and project product dissemination.

There are two primary data collection methods:

• Surveys of minors who have worked in the AES.
• In-depth interviews with victims of commercial sexual exploitation and sex trafficking who have been identified through the survey.

Survey instrument development

Researchers developed and tested a survey and qualitative interview protocol. Survey instruments were developed in the local context, to ensure they reflected Nepalese culture and norms. The instruments covered multiple forms of exploitation, including both labour and sexual exploitation. The qualitative interview protocol also included questions to elicit a deeper understanding of the often complex process of victimisation.

Measurement items developed for collecting data on the worst forms of child labour were based on the basic principles set forth in Article 3 of ILO Convention No. 182, 1999. The following stipulations apply:

a) All forms of slavery, or practices similar to slavery such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage, serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict.

b) The use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances.

c) The use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties.

d) Work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children. Specifically:

- Any work that involves underground, underwater, dangerous heights or confined spaces.
- Any work with dangerous machinery, equipment or tools, or which involves manual handling or transport of heavy loads.
- Any work with exposure to chemicals, extreme temperatures, very loud noises or strong vibrations.
- Any work that involves long hours or during the night.

A detailed flow chart depicting the operation of the ILO Convention is included in Annex A.

The instrument was also designed to determine whether working environments were sexually exploitative. The terminology – sexually exploitative work environments – is based upon the WHO definition and adapted for the Nepali context. This refers to working environments where:

- Power differentials or positions of vulnerability are used to enable actions of a sexual nature to take place, these include both contact and non-contact actions.
- Contact actions include kissing, touching of a sexual nature, and both penetrative and non-penetrative sexual relations.
- Non-contact actions include talking in a sexually suggestive manner, dancing erotically and watching of pornography.

Researchers made existing protocols sensitive to Nepali culture and norms, and ensured an appropriate reading and comprehension level for minors. Protocols were provided to the New ERA research team for feedback and further guidance on tailoring to the local culture. New ERA staff piloted the survey and interview guide in Nepal, receiving feedback which was subsequently incorporated into the protocols. The New ERA research team also translated the protocols into Nepali.
During a site visit to Kathmandu, John Jay College researchers trained the New ERA research team on surveys and protocols. They administered the survey and instructed staff to practice administration with each other. This allowed for additional feedback regarding appropriateness for Nepali culture and norms, with suggestions being incorporated into the final product.

**Data collection and field procedures**

Given the hidden nature of the study population, an RDS design was used to recruit individuals to participate in the study. Data collection was conducted in three phases, with a full sample size of 600. The first phase commenced with the selection of nine seeds for the RDS design. After 203 individuals were recruited for the study, an in-depth analysis of the key survey variables was undertaken. The results of this analysis gave rise to several concerns. For instance:

1) Population size estimates based on the procedure detailed in Handcock, Gile, and Mar (2014) were relatively small. This indicated that a large percentage of the population may not have been reachable through RDS procedure.

2) Estimates of key survey variables and the corresponding sensitivity analyses, showed that there was much agreement as to the composition of the RDS trees. This also suggested that the RDS design may not have been reaching into the full study population.

Accordingly, a second phase of RDS-based recruitment was implemented. Ten more seeds were added, selected to be as far away from the original nine seeds as possible in both geographic location and demographics. The RDS design continued until the target sample size of 600 was reached, which took up to 13 waves for some trees. Diagnostic tests, as presented in Gile (2011), showed that the RDS sample had reached sufficient convergence for estimation of population attributes.

The RDS sample was weighted using Gile’s successive weighting scheme (Gile, 2011). Weights are based on how networked an individual is, relative to other individuals in the sample. Weighted estimates were applied to all findings, so that fewer networked individuals were given appropriate exposure and more networked groups not overexposed in the overall findings. This practice enabled population characteristics to be inferred from the study findings.

Given the hidden nature, it was decided to base population size estimation on a well-known and statistically valid mark-recapture strategy. For the third phase of data collection, an additional sample of venue-based observations was used to augment the existing sample. This was likely to capture some individuals unreachable through RDS. A two-sample mark-recapture estimator was used to estimate the population size. Counts pertaining to the number of workers present by gender and minor-major status were made. Additionally, a sample of workers present at the observed venues was selected and asked their age in terms of minor-major (i.e. under or over 18 years). They were also asked whether they had heard of or participated in the RDS survey. This information was used in the classical two-sample mark-recapture estimator (Seber, 1970), along with a multiple imputation strategy. This imputed observations on the list of unobserved venues (Rubin, 1987), to obtain a point estimate of the population size and corresponding standard error.

Two phases of sampling were used for the venue-based study. The first was based on a partial sampling frame, and consisted of selecting 50 venues based on a stratified sampling approach. At an intermediate stage of sampling, in particular when 19 venues were observed, a more comprehensive sampling frame was made available to the research team. Based on discussion, the frame was partitioned into seven strata and based on stratified sampling. Allocation to strata was based on size, with the total number observations brought up to 94, 80 of these having non-zero counts. A hybrid strategy was used to capture individuals inaccessible via the RDS-design, so that a more honest estimate of population size could be made. For further detail about RDS and mark-recapture sampling, see Annex B.
Ethical considerations

The study was reviewed and approved by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice Institutional Review Board in March 2018. An approval letter was also provided by Nepal Central Child Welfare Board. To ensure that Institutional Review Board and human subject protection mandates were adhered to during data collection, researchers from John Jay College provided training for the New ERA research team. This included human subject protection, confidentiality measures, securing and managing data, identifying and responding to signs of trauma and minimising any safety concerns.

To ensure physical and emotional safety, researchers used safe, confidential interview locations. Interviews were held in close proximity to social service agencies and scheduled during the day. Counselling staff and social service agencies were made available to any participants who may have needed them. In the event of immediate assistance being needed, researchers would use their community contacts and make referrals for assessment and services. These services included emergency shelter, medical attention, mental health counselling and food. In the case of emergency, researchers would call the appropriate services to take the participant to hospital.

The study was voluntary and required consent from individuals to participate. Researchers provided potential participants with information about their rights within the study, including the option to stop at any point they chose, without repercussions. Adult participants provided consent. Minors also provided assent themselves as it was neither safe nor feasible for parents to know about the study. Indeed, in some cases, minors may have been placed in the AES by their parents.

No identifying information was collected by the researchers. Participants were assigned a unique identifier to differentiate between “seeds” and “referrals”. This enabled the research team to link-trace the network. Survey data was deleted from tablets after being uploaded to a secure cloud server, to which only lead researchers had access. Recordings of interviews were deleted from recording devices after being uploaded to a password-protected computer, accessible only to New ERA researchers.
Qualitative interviews

To understand further the context of the exploitation and trafficking of minors, in-depth qualitative interviews were administered. Questions were developed to explore issues such as working conditions, whether any force, fraud or coercion had been experienced and minors’ help-seeking behaviour. While there were questions regarding abuse experienced, interviewers did not request any in-depth information that would be insensitive or re-traumatising.

Participants were identified from those who had completed the full survey. Those selected were either victims or at high-risk of being exploited for commercial sex work. Altogether, 50 individuals agreed to an in-depth interview. Interviewers read them the informed consent and obtained verbal approval for recording in a separate setting. With participants’ permission, a digital recorder was used to record interviews. Participants were assured that it would not be used to identify them. In the event of a participant refusing to be recorded, notes would be taken. At the end, respondents were compensated for their time with 400 NPR.

Demographic profiles of minors from qualitative sample

In-depth, one-on-one interviews were conducted with 50 young people, purposely selected from the quantitative sample survey. The table below shows the demographics of this sample:

| Profiles of in-depth interview respondents  
| Gender | Children | 
| Female | 98% | No children | 86% |
| Male | 2% | Supporting a child | 14% |
| Current age | Education | 
| Average age | 17.6 years | 9 - 12 years schooling | 46% |
| Age range | 12 - 21 years | 1 - 5 years schooling | 26% |
| No formal education | 4% |
| Age first entered AES | Venues worked in | 
| Average | 15 years | Cabin restaurant | 38% |
| Age range | 7 - 20 years | Khaja Ghar | 22% |
| Dance bar | 20% |
| Single | Dohori | 18% |
| Married | Café | 2% |
| Seperated | 12% |

After interviews were completed, recordings were transferred to a laptop, labelled and sent to New ERA’s Kathmandu office for transcribing into Nepali. Following a review, transcripts were translated into English. Checks were undertaken to ensure clarity and consistency before sharing with the John Jay research team.
Analysis and findings

Profiles of workers

Two main recruitment criteria were used for the study. The respondent had to be aged between 12 and 21, and working in the AES in the Kathmandu Valley. Of the 600 individuals surveyed, the vast majority of respondents identified as female (91 percent), with 9 percent identifying as male. Slightly fewer than half the participants were under 18 at the time of the study (45 percent), with 9 percent having been under 15 and 36 percent between 15 and 17. Slightly more than half the sample (55 percent) were between 18-21.

Young people working in the AES primarily affiliated with the Brahmin/Chhetri caste (34 percent), followed by Tamang (18 percent), 15 percent (Magar), Newar (8 percent), Rai (6 percent), Tharu/Majhi/Pariyar (4 percent) and other (16 percent).

Almost all those working in the AES had received some level of education (97 percent). Only a very small percentage had no formal education (1 percent) or no education at all (2 percent). At the time of data collection, approximately half those under 18 (49.8 percent) were enrolled in school and slightly more than half (50.2 percent) were not.

Ninety-one percent of those working in the AES identified as female, nine percent as male, none identified as transgender. Participants were not asked to identify their sexual orientation as part of the survey. It is known that commercial sexual exploitation exists elsewhere in Kathmandu and it may be that males and LGBTQI groups are at higher-risk in settings other than the AES. However, this was outside of the scope of this study and would require additional research.

---

Ages of young workers in the adult entertainment sector (AES)

- 18 - 21 years: 55%
- 14 years & under: 9%
- 15 - 17 years: 36%

Caste of workers

- Brahmin/Chhetri: 34%
- Tamang: 18%
- Magar: 15%
- Newar: 8%
- Rai: 6%
- Tharu/Majhi/Pariyar: 4%
- Other: 16%
Prevalence of minors in the adult entertainment sector

To provide an accurate estimation of the prevalence of minors in the AES a total of three different methods have been used. Each of these methods takes a different approach to estimation, with each method selected to make up for a shortcoming in the others. Given these different approaches, each method serves to cross-reference the others, further verifying the final estimate. The coalescing of the results of these different methods around a common point instils confidence regarding the final estimation.

This study estimates a population of minors in the AES in Kathmandu of 1,650 (with a margin of error of ±23). The study also found 17 percent of AES workers to be minors. This percentage constitutes a point estimate of 1,550 minors (with a margin of error of ±13), hence the overlap with the leading RDS estimate, see detail below. No prevalence study would be without limitations, these are detailed in the limitations of the study section (page 17). Detail of the estimation is provided in this section, with further detail in annex B.

Estimating the prevalence of the hidden population required a three-stage approach: the two-pronged RDS approach accounting for two of these stages, with the third being a colleague disclosure approach.

As mentioned, each method has been specifically selected to overcome any shortcomings in the other. For example, a shortcoming of RDS is that it does not observe overlaps between networks. The initial population size estimate, using RDS alone, showed a significant divergence from previous studies and also from service providers’ on-the-ground knowledge. Therefore, to overcome such limitations and cross-reference the findings, a venue-based study was introduced. The Lincoln-Petersen estimator was used to approximate the size of the 21 and under AES population in the study region, based on venue observations and RDS responses. Essentially, the RDS sample size is needed, together with the number of individuals interviewed from the venues and the number of interviewees who completed the RDS study.
A multiple imputation procedure, based on stratification by geographical region of the venues, was used to increase the precision of the estimator by imputing the “missing entries” in the sample frame. The final estimate of the population of those aged 21 and under in the AES was 3,664. This estimate has a standard error of 267 and 95 percent confidence interval of (3141, 4187).

In order to estimate the proportion of minors working in the AES, two approaches were used to triangulate the result:

The RDS weighted estimate for the proportion of minors was 0.4522, with a standard error of 0.0418. The mark-recapture estimate for the number of individuals under or equal to the age of 21 was 3,664, with a standard error of 267. These two estimates were used to obtain an estimate of 1,657 minors in the population. The calculations behind this estimate, standard error and corresponding confidence interval are as follows:

Let \( \hat{X} \) be the estimate of the proportion of minors, and \( \hat{Y} \) that of the number of individuals under or equal to the age of 21. A suitable point estimate for the number of minors in the population is the product of these two values, \( \hat{Z} = \hat{X} \hat{Y} = 1,656.86 \).

In order to obtain a variance estimate for \( \hat{Z} \), an approximation to the covariance of \( \hat{X} \) and \( \hat{Y} \) is needed. Given that these two variables arise from two separate studies, this is virtually impossible at this time. For this reason, the two variables are treated as independent and their covariance is set to zero. The corresponding variance expression is

\[
\text{Var}(Z) = \text{Var}(X)\text{Var}(Y) + \text{Var}(X)Y^2 + \text{Var}(Y)\hat{X}^2.
\]

This yields an estimate for the standard error of the estimate of the number of minors of 195.34. The corresponding 95 percent confidence interval based on the central limit theorem is (1,273.99; 2,039.73).

A word of caution, however. This confidence interval is conservative. The above could be narrower than the true confidence interval. The confidence interval provided does not account for covariance between \( X \) and \( Y \), as there is no known way of calculating a confidence interval to inherit this feature. As such, we are choosing to treat the two estimates as independent.

The RDS survey provided another means of estimating the population of minors. This additional information was used to triangulate the findings above. All respondents were asked to specify the proportion of workers under the age of 18 in their venues. The RDS weighted estimate for the number of minors per venue is 1.695 with a standard error of 0.112. This amounts to an estimation that 17 percent of workers in the AES are under 18. This proportion estimate has a standard error of 0.0151, and a 95 percent confidence interval based on the central limit theorem (0.1402; 0.1994), calculated using the delta method.

This finding corresponds to that above. The total number of venues known to the research team is 915, although it is expected that the real number of venues is far larger. However, going off the number of known venues, a point estimate for the number of minors in the population is 1,550.93, with standard error 102.48. The corresponding 95 percent confidence interval, based on the central limit theorem, is (1,350.07; 1,751.79).

**Conditions of work**

Young people working in the AES in the Kathmandu Valley were employed in a variety of venues and take on a range of tasks as part of their work. The most common venues worked in were khaja ghars (snack bars) at 28 percent, followed closely by dohoris (entertainment restaurants with dance and traditional songs) at 25 percent. 12-15 percent of survey participants worked at cabin restaurants, dance bars and guest houses. Few young people (2 percent) were seen to be working in massage parlours, although one reason for this may be the reported increase in raids by law enforcement during the data collection period.
Young people typically perform a number of different activities at work, with the majority taking food and/or drink orders (76 percent) and cleaning the venue, table and dishes (56 percent). Many of the survey participants are also expected to sell and serve alcohol (30 percent) and keep the clients company (18 percent). Through the qualitative interviews, we learnt that a number of young people were not expecting this to be part of the job, and were upset to learn that they were required to partake in these activities. One 21-year-old woman, who first started working in a khaja ghar at the age of 18 and was working at a cabin restaurant at the time of the interview, explained:

"There are cabin restaurants where the job of the waiter is only to serve food. I thought I would be doing that but I wasn't. It doesn't matter how much the guest eats. We have to order food and drinks and add to the bill. Our work is to increase the guest's bill as much as possible. When a new girl comes in, the owner will put her on trial for 2-3 days and see how much business she can generate. If she can't, then she is thrown out. —21-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (14511)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of work - venues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khaja restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage parlour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Khaja ghar (snack restaurants)** often serve as an entry point for girls and young women into the commercial sex industry. Grooming practices, such as chatting and flirting, are used to establish a rapport with the waitresses and can be a precursor to the provision of sexual services.

**Dohori (traditional folk-dance bars)** male and female dancers perform to live music. The bars are frequented by families and sexual services are not provided on the premises, although customers may make arrangements with waitresses to meet for sex elsewhere after work hours.

**Contemporary dance bars** feature young women and girls dancing to Bollywood music in short dresses or sometimes naked. They may smoke or drink with male customers and afterwards go to hotels or guest houses for sexual services.

‘**Cabin restaurants**’ sell sexual services directly and offer the privacy of small compartments. Waitresses provide a range of sexual services, such as intimate touching, masturbation or oral sex. Nearby hotels or guest houses are used for intercourse.

**Massage parlours** are often disguised brothels that provide sex within the parlour premises in small cabins with a bed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities performed at work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking food/drink orders, waitressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning venue, tables, dishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling or serving alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting with clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing, dancing, performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing food or cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flirting, kissing, or physical intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although only a small percentage of workers reported flirting, kissing or physical intimacy (6 percent) and massage (2 percent) as central activities, many more disclosed working in a sexually exploitative environment. This will be discussed in more detail below.

Overall, survey participants earned a monthly income of 6,134 NPR (57 USD) with an additional 3,279 NPR (31 USD) in tips. Young people working in a dance bar received, on average, the most money per month at 13,690 NPR (131 USD). Those who worked in a khaja ghar received the least, 6,311 NPR (59 USD) including tips.

In addition to a monthly salary and tips, some also received other in-kind benefits such as meals, days off, housing and transportation. In many cases, they were told about these additional benefits prior to accepting the job. However, some respondents reported that although they were told they would receive these things, they never did.

The terms and conditions under which a lot of young people accepted these jobs was often a function of who had connected them to the work, along with their desperation to find employment. The next section will explore under what circumstances young people are looking for work in the AES, and how they are finding these jobs.

### Locations of AES venues in Kathmandu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Buspark</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamel</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitanagar</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalanki</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoyambu</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapan</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machhapokhari</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundhara</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gongabu</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samakhushi</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanepa</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamal</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouddha</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basundhara</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaju</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thimi</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorpati</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas in KTM</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average earnings per month, in NPR (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>Tips</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average overall</td>
<td>6,134</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>9,413 NPR (88 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance bar</td>
<td>7,165</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>13,960 NPR (131 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohori</td>
<td>5,958</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>10,692 NPR (100 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin restaurant</td>
<td>6,531</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>10,509 NPR (98 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage parlor</td>
<td>5,694</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>9,856 NPR (92 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>8,106 NPR (76 USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaja restaurant</td>
<td>5,521</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>6,311 NPR (59 USD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was told I would be given leave if there was a need, but if we called in sick, then we were abused over the phone and threatened that our salary would be cut off if we didn’t show up at work. We were called whore and whore’s daughter. – 21-year-old woman, dohari (1110).

### Entry into the adult entertainment sector

The majority of AES workers began work in the sector as minors, with 62 percent under 18 when they started. There is currently debate within the trafficking field as to whether or not someone under the age of 18 possesses enough agency to make a choice about working in the AES (Dank et al. 2015, Cianciarlo 2008). It is argued that minors are not able to weigh up the risks of engaging in this type of work, with many unable to refuse the opportunity for work due to vulnerable personal situations (e.g. homeless, abuse survivor, poverty-stricken etc.).
When young people were asked whether it was their choice to work in the AES, an overwhelming 98 percent said yes. No one had coerced them. However, it could be argued that many face constrained agency. In other words, they have few options to choose from in order to survive and/or assist with the survival of their families. Therefore they decide to work in this industry, due either to lack of job options or because AES pay is higher than the other low-skilled jobs available. Another argument, which will be discussed later, is that some of these young people were deceived and unaware they would be subject to such exploitation.

During the qualitative interviews, many youths relayed stories of poverty, debt, familial illness, abuse, lack of acceptance and a yearning for education:

My life has always been difficult, even when father was alive. He used to get drunk all the time and wouldn’t take care of the family. We struggled to survive every day and would often be hungry. Mother couldn’t work either, she was ill. There is no one to support me. – 21-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (19035)

To support my family, mother used to work there and she was the breadwinner of the family. After she got sick and couldn’t continue to work, I went there as her replacement. – 16-year-old girl, dance bar (16058)

Mother got sick and we didn’t have money to buy medicine for her. There were problems at home. We didn’t have enough to eat and there are lots of mouths to feed. Daddy couldn’t work and mummy had cancer. Daddy is also not well, he couldn’t work so I had to drop out of school and start working. – 15-year-old girl, dohari/dance bar (seed 9)

The majority of young people were connected to their job in the AES through someone they knew. They could be friends (35 percent), family members (23 percent) or neighbours (11 percent). Others found work through meeting someone already working for the establishment or through a job announcement. As discussed earlier, few stated that it was not their choice to enter this sector. Because they were often introduced to the job
through someone they knew and trusted, there was less hesitation and fewer questions asked about what it entailed. In addition, there was the added comfort that they already knew someone working there.

One 17-year-old woman currently in year 10 at school stated that she found the job through school friends:

*My school friends were working, they used to talk about it. I didn’t have money to buy snacks at school so I used to stay back in class during lunch break. So when friends asked if I wanted to work, I said yes.* – 17-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (8052)

Although only 7 percent of young people working in AES were native to Kathmandu, 44 percent were originally from Province 3 which includes Kathmandu District and Bhaktapur District. Thus, the majority engaged in AES didn’t migrate from more remote parts of the country. Most of the young people first started working in the AES when they were under 18 (62 percent), with 18 percent starting when they were 14 or younger.

Many had come to Kathmandu with the intention of studying. However, they later found they were forced to drop out of school due to lack of resources. Others chose to work alongside studying. Some faced tough choices about future work opportunities and the value of studying compared to their current work:

*We didn’t have any money. I needed to support myself and I wasn’t going to school. Then I met auntie and she admitted me to school and I started working again [to support my education].* – 13-year-old girl, restaurant (8020)

One young woman who started working when she was 15 dropped out of school around the time she began working in a dance bar, mainly to escape her family:

*I had been living here (Kathmandu) before working. I was studying in a government school. Father would come home drunk and the landlord would throw us out. We would be moving around constantly. I would stay with friends mostly. I didn’t want to go home.* – 15-year-old girl, dance bar (19035)

As seen, the vast majority of young people working in the AES stated that it was their own decision to enter the sector. However, given the young age of many when they started, it can be argued that they are not able to give full consent. Furthermore, it is unclear whether they were fully aware of what the work would entail and what they would be exposed to during their daily routine. Additionally, many young people felt pushed towards these jobs as they found themselves in desperate situations and had few, if any, other options. Others were working to support their education. The next section describes the sexually exploitative environment in which the youths worked.
A sexually exploitative work environment

The venues that make up the AES – dohoris, khaja ghars, massage parlours, cabin restaurants, dance bars, guest houses – are not all inherently sexually exploitative by design. For example, many families will go to a dohori for dinner and to watch women and men perform traditional dances, songs and music. However, depending on the time of day and clientele, most of these venues become sexually exploitative environments. The majority of young people working in the AES (68 percent) reported working in such an environment. What’s more, the levels of exploitation were high for all regardless of age, as shown in the graph above.

The types of sexual exploitation that youths face at work are varied. They range from flirting and verbal harassment to groping and touching to forced sex acts.

Some guests are good and some are bad. Some touch you here and there, some stay far away and buy you tons of food and drinks and leave generous tips, while some sit close to you and pinch you all over. – 21-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (14513)

A 16 year old woman who had worked in a guest house since the age of 12 discussed being groomed by the guest house owner and clients, and being physically abused when she didn’t comply:

Sometimes when guests get drunk they tease us. The owner tells me to massage him and kiss him. The massage is sexual. It has happened 3-4 times. The owner gets really angry so I am scared to say no. I am scared he will beat me. The guests make you read dirty stories and if you don’t then they beat you. – 16-year-old girl, guest house (8092)

Although some types of adult entertainment venue were not as sexually exploitative as others, in each one over 50 percent of young people reported being sexually exploited. Massage parlours had the most sexually exploitative environments (90 percent). However, during the course of data collection, New ERA researchers reported that law enforcement agents were conducting more raids and using enforcement more often. This was resulting in fewer reports of sexual exploitation, particularly from minors.

Cabin restaurants were cited as the second most sexually exploitative venue (86 percent). 15 percent of the sample population reported working in this type of establishment at the time of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexually exploitative places of work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AES venues considered sexually exploitative</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage parlor</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin restaurant</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance bar</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohori</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaja restaurant</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest houses</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One 21-year-old woman working in a cabin restaurant described an environment that was not only exploitative but also abusive:

Although some types of adult entertainment venue were not as sexually exploitative as others, in each one over 50 percent of young people reported being sexually exploited. Massage parlours had the most sexually exploitative environments (90 percent). However, during the course of data collection, New ERA researchers reported that law enforcement agents were conducting more raids and using enforcement more often. This was resulting in fewer reports of sexual exploitation, particularly from minors.

Cabin restaurants were cited as the second most sexually exploitative venue (86 percent). 15 percent of the sample population reported working in this type of establishment at the time of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexually exploitative places of work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AES venues considered sexually exploitative</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage parlor</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin restaurant</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance bar</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohori</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaja restaurant</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest houses</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One 21-year-old woman working in a cabin restaurant described an environment that was not only exploitative but also abusive:
One 21-year-old woman described what it was like to work at a cabin restaurant. She provided details about the abuse she suffered, and claimed that engaging in commercial sex work was just part of the job:

Guests scold us when we don’t join them or go out with them, they get drunk and scold for not doing it properly. They say we are wasting money on this whore… Rather than being forced to engage in sex work, it’s something I have accepted. If I go with guests, the owner is happy as the guests will come back again, and I also make some extra money from it. There is no force. – 21-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (19035)

A 20-year-old woman who worked in a dance bar reported being filmed while changing by the owner, along with the other women who worked there. However, they would receive assistance from the bar owner’s wife in order to avoid having to go home with any of the guests. Not that this provided immunity from being harassed and threatened by guests:

While sitting with the guests, we say we will go with them but after closing down we are stowed away in the staff vehicle and dropped home. The owner’s wife arranges it. She helps us. So far I haven’t had to go with guests. Some guests threaten to buy us for 2 lakhs (1700 USD). They say we should be sold to brothels in India. The only fear is that the owner will leak our dressing room videos and our families will see them and we will lose face. That’s why we have remained silent. – 20-year-old woman, dance bar (17008)
When breaking down the types of sexual exploitation these young people are facing, there is one finding that stands out most. People working in these venues, whether they are 12 or 21, are all experiencing various forms of victimisation. The graphs below clearly demonstrate this. Confidence intervals are provided to show the potential range of prevalence of each type of sexually exploitative action.

Youths between the ages of 18-21 are more likely to experience overall sexual exploitation (72 percent) than those 14 and under (60 percent) and 15-17 (66 percent). Note the broad confidence interval for those aged 14 and under working in a sexually exploitative environment, meaning the true figure could be between 32 percent and 89 percent. For the slightly older populations, there is greater precision about the numbers working in sexually exploitative environments, as the graphs show. There are also differences in the extent to which different age groups are being forced to engage in the more abusive forms of sexual exploitation (e.g. oral, vaginal or anal sex). The 18 – 21 age group are most likely to experience this (9 percent). However, the percentage differences among age groups are often minimal, with the exception of “made to kiss, cuddle or perform intimate touching”. 29 percent of youths 14 and under, 42 percent of 15-17s and 52 percent of 18-21s reporting being forced to perform these activities.

Overall, 68 percent of young workers reported working in a sexually exploitative environment. Although those working for a massage parlour, cabin restaurant and dance bar reported higher rates of exploitation, all adult entertainment venues appeared to provide environments conducive to high rates of sexual victimisation. Regardless of age, young people are having to endure harassment, threats, unwanted touching and abuse as part of their jobs and have very little recourse either to seek justice or find other opportunities.

Worst forms of child labour

As detailed in the survey instrument development section, measurement items on the worst forms of child labour were based on the basic principles set forth in Article 3 of ILO Convention No. 182, 1999 (detailed in Annex A). The aspects specifically focused on were: long hours, late hours, illegal alcohol and drug use, forced labour, debt bondage and a sexually exploitative work environment. Overall, 99 percent of the population aged 17 or younger had experiences that met the criteria. The graphs below clearly illustrate the range of conditions each age group is working in. Again, the bars represent confidence intervals, illustrating the potential range of minors experiencing each condition.

The nature of working in the AES often requires working late hours, since that is when the majority of guests frequent these venues. Thus, it comes as no surprise that a majority of minors (74 percent aged 14 and under and 66 percent 15-17) reported working late. Additionally, many young people were expected to work long hours, with limited breaks. One 12-year-old girl who worked at a guest house described working from 6 am – 10 pm, six days a week, with just a three-hour break:
I get up at 6 am and work until 12 pm. From 1 pm to 4 pm I take a rest and from 5 pm to 9 or 10 pm I work. I work six days a week. Good people don’t come here, but some bad people are worse than others. They think all kinds of things about me and say things to me. If I get angry and raise my voice then I will lose my job, and how will I earn money? – 12-year-old girl, guest house (5259)

Another 15-year-old girl who worked in a dance bar reported working from 6pm-12am every day, and having to endure frequent verbal and sexual abuse:

I work from 6 pm to 12 am, seven days a week. I don’t like it there. I wish I didn’t have to work there. The guests misbehave with you. They verbally abuse you, try to kiss you, and try to touch you physically. --15-year-old girl, dance bar (seed 9)

As discussed in the previous section, the majority of young people under 18 (60 percent of those 14 and under and 66 percent of 15-17s) reported working in a sexually exploitative environment. One 13-year-old girl who worked in a guest house discussed working late hours, in addition to having to endure various forms of verbal, physical and sexual abuse:

I work from 5 am to 9 am and then 4 pm to 8 pm. I work six days, Saturdays off. If I don’t do what the guests tell me, they beat and scold me. The guests try to touch me and pinch my breasts. The owners kick and hit you. –13-year-old girl, guest house (8035)

With regards to illegal drinking and/or drug use, 28 percent of youths 14 and under and 35 percent of 15-17s reported being forced to engage in illegal drinking/drug use.

Almost one-quarter of youths (23 percent) reported experiencing various forms of forced labour. This ranged from subtle forms of coercion, such as not being able to leave because their home was too far away, to more severe forms of abuse like sexual and physical violence. Those 14 and younger were more likely to be victims of forced labour (28 percent), with 27 percent of 15-17s and 20 percent
of 18-21s falling victim. This might be indicative of the overall work environment for those aged 14 and under, given that many reported having little to no agency regarding the tasks they were given to do and hours they were expected to work.

Emotional violence is the most common form of abuse at 15 percent, particularly for youths 14 and younger (26 percent). A 13-year-old girl who lived and worked in a guest house described working long hours, not getting paid for months, being deprived of money for medicine and being constantly scolded when she asked for her pay:

_I wash dishes, clean everything before they wake up. I work 1.5 to 3 hours, 5 am to 8 am. I work from 4 pm to 6 pm after school. I work all day. It is difficult and they don’t give money. They haven’t paid in 5 months and when I ask for money, they scold me instead. When I got sick, I needed money. I asked for 800 (rupees) for medicine but they only gave 150 (rupees) (1.40 USD). _–13-year-old girl, guest house (8020)

Although few youths (2 percent) reported physical violence being used to force them to work, approximately 25 percent of those interviewed described being beaten by the owner and/or guests. One 20-year-old woman who worked at a dance bar described in detail the various forms of abuse and coercion that she has to endure at the hands of her employer on a daily basis:

_I am not happy here. I would like to leave but the owners won’t let me and warn me from leaving the job. They beat me the first day. I said I wanted to leave this place. The owner had told me that he wanted to marry me, but he already had a wife. I was sitting with a guest and he asked why. I threatened to leave the place and I was taken to the room upstairs and beaten with a dinner spoon – 20-year-old woman, dance bar (17008).
The same woman described how her employer tricked her into signing a two-year contract. He has threatened to sue her if she doesn’t stay at the job:

He [The owner] had a camera installed in our dressing room and filmed us changing. He blackmills us with it and says if we leave his place then he will put our videos on Facebook. He has done this to seven out of the 12 ladies working there.

He says that we have signed an agreement with him and so we are not free to leave him. Unknown to us, six of us had been tricked into signing this agreement with him while we were drunk. He said that we have signed an agreement to work for him for two years and if we don’t then he will file a case against us. That fear is making us work.

Nearly all youths under 18 working in the AES are victims of the worst forms of child labour. They work long hours, often late at night in highly sexually exploitative environments. Regardless of age, many experience various forms of forced labour, with emotional abuse the most common. That said, during the one-on-one interviews more reported experiencing physical violence than in the surveys. This may be because they felt more comfortable when talking to the interviewers. It may also be because they had normalised the beatings and did not consider them to be physical violence as such. This issue might require further investigation.
Restrictions on freedom

Restrictions on freedom, ranging from limited movement during non-work hours to being prevented from communicating with family, was a form of coercion more commonly experienced by youths 14 and younger (30 percent). This may be because younger workers were more likely to be in controlled working environments. However, overall 20 percent of young people had restrictions placed on their freedom of movement and communication. The most common form is restricted movement during non-work hours (12 percent), followed by being forbidden to leave the worksite (7 percent), being prevented or restricted from communicating with family (6 percent) and not permitted to seek or receive medical services (3 percent).

One 13-year-old girl who worked in a guest house stated that she is “not allowed to go out. I escaped to come here today.” When asked if she is able to communicate with her family, she claimed, “Once a month the owner gives me his own phone. I can’t meet my parents.” (8035)

20 percent of young workers reported having their freedom restricted. When asked to describe these restrictions in greater detail, many claimed they weren’t allowed to use their phones or leave the premises during work hours. For those working long hours, this is extremely problematic. However, for those who worked 4 to 6 hours a day, this is not considered out of the ordinary.

Experience of violence

Minors working in the AES often have to endure a wide range of violence at the hands of employers, guests and even co-workers. Overall, 72 percent experience some form of violence at their job. There seems to be very little difference among age ranges as they are all victims of abuse, regardless of age. In some cases, this means severe forms of violence such as rape and attempted murder.

The most common forms of violence for all youths included being pressured to talk, joke and flirt verbally (64 percent); made to kiss, cuddle, and perform intimate activities (46 percent); and intimidated by being shouted at and smashing things (27 percent). In fact, these are the top three forms of violence regardless of age group, albeit in different ranking orders. That said, youths 14 and younger are more likely to be punched, dragged, kicked and beaten (20 percent) than 15-17-year-olds (3 percent) and 18s and older (5 percent). This might be because the younger you are, the more likely an abuser is to resort to physical violence in order to ensure submission and exert power and control. Another notable finding among the different age groups is that the older one got, the more likely they are to be forced into performing oral, vaginal and anal sex.
When asked whether or not they experienced any abuse at work, youths described a variety of abuses, some in horrific detail. The following quotes provide a snapshot of the types of abuse these young people experience during their working lives:

The owner says he will kill me if I leave. He says he will tell my family that I’ve been put to work in another place and kill and make me vanish. Guests have hit me many times. – 13-year-old girl, guest house (8035)

At the job before this one [cabin restaurant], the owners threatened to torture and kill my child if I didn’t sleep with the guests. The owner, she tried to strangle my son and he had bruises all over his body to keep me in line. He would bleed and still has a lot of stitches from those days. I wasn’t the only one. They have ruined the lives of so many other women as well. They [the owners] are now in prison. – 21-year-old woman, dance bar (seed 13)

The food she gives us is ok, but the auntie shouts a lot and beats us. The guests use dirty language. Only junkies come here. They call us whores. Sometimes the uncles and the junkies hit [us] without any reason. They say bring the lighter. If I say I am working, they will come and hit us. – 12-year-old girl, guest house (8054)

The guests offer us money to sleep with them, they try to touch us in intimate parts, but when we go complaining to the owner, he tells us without it there will be no business. We have to endure it. They call us whores. They talk dirty to us and say that they want to suck on our body and to touch us. We don’t touch guests’ phones but they keep insisting that we watch it [pornography] together. We have complained to the owner but he tells us to indulge the guest and watch it. In the past 13 months, I have been beaten six or seven times. – 20-year-old woman, dance bar (17008)
Customers dupe us and take us out and bring two to three friends and rape us. They don't pay us. Once, they were brothers I didn't know. After the customer was done, he called the brother and forced me. I told him I had come only for him. I couldn't do it but then the brother called his friend too and his friend. They were drunk and it was daylight. I wasn't paid in the end. There was no question of asking for money. I felt I was lucky to have escaped alive from there. – 21-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (19035)

The clients walk in already drunk and force us to drink as well. They pull our hair, make us smoke even if we don't want to. They refuse to wear condoms; they say it doesn't give them pleasure. And on top of it, they leave without paying. – 21-year-old woman, cabin restaurant (19036)

The various forms of violence, and the frequency with which youths experience them, are cause for concern. Nearly three-quarters of youths engaged in the AES suffer a minimum of one form of violence, the majority more than one. Establishment owners expect the youths to make guests happy, whatever the cost. This often leads to them being physically and sexually harassed and assaulted by the guests. If they do not comply with guests’ demands, it can lead to physical violence from the owner. This often results in high levels of despair and helplessness.

Legal options for workers: although criminal justice channels for workers who have been exploited exist the conviction rates remain very low. This is partly due worker’s low levels of trust in the police, meaning they are fearful of reporting their employer and doubt their word will be believed against that of the employer. An issue exacerbated by instances where the police have been complicit in the exploitation.
Limitations of the study

Respondent-driven sampling (RDS) was the method selected, due to its strengths in estimating the characteristics of hidden but networked populations. However, it should be acknowledged that RDS has limitations. RDS is built upon the assumption that all subjects maintain social networks. This means that if young people working in the AES are kept in isolation with little outside contact, recruitment would be biased. Our sampling method would be restricted to estimating the distribution of the networked/connected part of the study population. For this reason, the mark-recapture approach was introduced. This reduced the impact of this limitation and gauged the extent of the hidden non-networked population by observing the overlaps.

Nonetheless, this issue remains a significant limitation. There are no easy means of recruiting and interviewing young people working in the AES who are held in complete physical isolation. As such, this limitation should be noted. Indeed, the findings revealed that there are workers who are harder to reach, such as those with few or no social networks. Future research efforts can minimise this limitation by deploying an experienced field team with extensive community connections to establish multiple sampling entry points.

Furthermore, when the third stage of the estimation approach was used to generate a point estimate it relies upon a list of “known” venues in the Kathmandu Valley. We are aware of the informal nature of many AES venues, and that many open up and shut down quickly. Known venues to the research team were 915 at the time of the study, however, it is thought the true number is higher.

There was also some difficulty in recruiting subjects who met the inclusion criteria. This was due to a higher frequency of enforcement agency raids during the field work, and young people not being allowed to leave work premises to meet research staff.

We also believe that there was an under-reporting of negative and traumatising experiences. This was because either they are too stigmatising for the respondents to disclose, or the experiences are so socially normalised they are not perceived as abuse. This was apparent when looking at the rates of physical abuse reported in the survey versus what was disclosed in one-on-one interviews. Due to this phenomenon, it’s possible that actual rates of exploitation are much higher than reported here and the estimation put forward is likely conservative.

A final point to mention is that this study has focused exclusively on CSEC within the AES in the Kathmandu Valley. However, sexual exploitation of minors is not confined to the AES. Rather, unfortunately, we are aware that CSEC is taking place in other locations such as private residences or the street. It was outside of the scope of the study to measure the prevalence of minors within these locations.
Conclusion and recommendations

This study represents the most methodologically rigorous attempt at estimating the number of minors involved in the AES in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. Earlier attempts to measure the prevalence of this population, conducted almost ten years ago, resulted in higher numbers than have been estimated here (Frederick et al. 2010; Maiti Nepal 2010). However, we believe our two-pronged approach to measuring is more rigorous and, as a result, more accurate. It is possible that the population has reduced during this time period, although this would be hard to determine concretely since data has not been collected over the last ten years.

Unlike other countries where CSEC in known to take place, such as India and the Philippines, there is a very informal recruitment process into the AES. A young person often learns about a job through a neighbour, friend or relative already working in this sector. They are often driven to work in the sector to provide monetary support for their family, or to pay for their education. In some cases, youths run away from home due to abuse and neglect, and are working in the AES in order to pay for basic needs such as shelter, food and clothing.

The majority of young people are under the age of 18 when they first entered into this profession (62 percent). However, almost every single participant stated it was their decision to go into this line of work. That said, given the young age of many, it is not clear whether they had full agency to make this choice. Furthermore, many were not fully aware of what the job would entail and the levels of violence they would be exposed to. Some youths did state that they knew the job would entail some level of harassment and exploitation, however.

The majority of study participants (68 percent) reported working in a sexually exploitative environment. They are forced to endure a wide range of exploitation and abuse, from verbal harassment to being forced to perform intimate activities. Most youths, regardless of age group, are expected to talk, joke and flirt with guests. However, once a young person turns 15 years of age, it is more likely that they will be made to kiss, cuddle or perform intimate touching, in addition to an increasing likelihood of being forced to perform oral, vaginal or anal sex. According to New ERA field researchers who documented additional observations during data collection, small, unregulated tea houses, khaja ghars and dance clubs employing 2-3 people are the venues where abuse is most rife. NGOs have a hard time gaining access to less formal places such as these, which often shut down suddenly if there is unwanted attention from the police or community.

Almost all youths under the age of 18 met the criteria for the worst forms of child labour. The majority are employed in sexually exploitative work environments. They work long hours (12-14 hours) and/or late nights, 7 days a week. In some cases, they are not paid for months, or have money deducted from their pay for food and transportation despite being promised the opposite during recruitment.

Regarding coercion and restrictions on freedom by employers, youths of 14 and younger are more likely than their older counterparts to experience emotional violence or threats of harm to a family member. They also face greater restrictions on communication and movement. Additionally, minors of 14 and younger are more likely to experience physical violence than those 15 and older.

However, in-depth interviews revealed a high incidence of workers of all ages being scolded, hit or beaten by owners/managers or customers (42 percent).

Despite this, physical violence as such was not reported greatly through the survey. It may be that being scolded, hit or beaten is not considered to be a form of physical violence. Youths between the ages of 15-21 are more likely to be forced to perform intimate activities, dance erotically and watch pornography. In summary, youths of 14 and younger are more likely to experience physical and emotional violence, in addition to restrictions on freedom, whereas those aged 15 - 21 are more likely to experience sexual violence.
Recommendations for The Government of Nepal

1. Ratify the UNTIP Protocol (Palermo), demonstrating the Government’s commitment to countering human trafficking in Nepal.

2. Integrate the Palermo provisions with Nepal’s anti-trafficking legislation so that it aligns with international law.

3. Ensure that the adult entertainment sector is classified as hazardous work, in line with ILO Convention No.182.

Recommendations for law enforcement

4. More frequent monitoring visits to the AES venues to detect minors. The recent Child Rights Act (2018) prohibits minors from entering or being used in adult entertainment venues. Law enforcement agencies have a crucial role in enforcing this regulation, through regular inspections and the removal of any minors found.

5. Improve coordination between law enforcement and service providers. To ensure support services are available immediately, monitoring visits should be conducted in coordination with service providers including both NGOs and government officials.

6. Increase efforts to prosecute owners and managers who employ minors through the Child Rights Act (2018). This is necessary not only to challenge what CSOs have observed as a culture of impunity but also to act as a deterrent.

Recommendations for local civil society

There are a number of ways civil society can support victims and those at risk:

7. Building peer networks among the AES workers. Many workers reported feeling isolated and unable to speak to other young people at work, further increasing their vulnerability and preventing them from knowing their rights as workers. Peer networks could be used to disseminate knowledge about appropriate practices at work, and to promote more protective behaviours for workers.

Civil society organisations (CSOs) can also reduce exploitation by working with employers:

8. Outreach to venue owners/managers employing higher standards. In order to support child labour-free venues and improve labour conditions for workers, CSOs should engage with owners open to becoming ‘champions’.

9. Behaviour change campaigns to shape behaviours of clients and venue owners/managers. Many workers’ accounts involved abusive behaviour from customers and owners/managers. The acceptance of such behaviour amongst certain subgroups suggests that specific norms and attitudes may exist. These attitudes can be challenged by targeting underlying norms.

Recommendations for further research

10. Research to determine the extent of sexual exploitation of minors has shifted away from adult entertainment venues. Recently, there has been increased attention on the AES, in the shape of more frequent raids from law enforcement and outreach from civil society organisations. It may be that exploitation is continuing to take place but has been driven further underground to more hidden venues. For instance, there is anecdotal evidence to suggest an increase in sexual exploitation of minors in private residences where the internet has been the communication platform. Furthermore, this study has only focused on AES venues and has not included minors who work on the street or in private residences. Further research would be required to understand the scale of this.

11. Research to determine viable alternative livelihoods. Many young people working in the AES were doing so because they were unable to find other work, or at least other work that would allow them to sustain themselves and their families. To overcome this, it is recommended that an assessment be made to identify what viable livelihood options exist. These should provide a dignified occupation and not have unreasonable barriers to entry for this population.

12. Research into the social norms existing within the subset of men who frequent AES venues in order to promote behaviour change. Given the many accounts of men in these venues behaving abusively towards staff, research should be conducted to determine whether certain social norms exist that permit this type of behaviour within this subgroup. This insight could then be used to develop interventions, potentially in the form of behavioural change campaigns to improve behaviour towards young girls and women.
Annex A: ILO’s worst forms of child labour convention

Conceptual definition

1. All forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and servitude and forced or compulsory labor, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict.

2. The use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances.

3. The use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties.

4. Work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children. Specifically:
   a. Any work that involves underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;
   b. Any work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads;
   c. Any work with exposure to chemicals, extreme temperatures, very loud noises, or strong vibrations;
   d. Any work that involves long hours or during the night.

Source: Article 3 of ILO Convention No. 182, 1999

Operational definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>1. Dangerous hours of work</th>
<th>2. Dangerous working environment</th>
<th>3. Forced labour (defined as inability to leave/refuse work without suffering a penalty)</th>
<th>4. Bonded labour</th>
<th>5. Involved in illicit activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Typically work ≥43 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
<td>In any of last 3 jobs, within last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Typically work before 5am or after 10pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>In any of last 3 jobs, within last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious injury</td>
<td>Dangerous height</td>
<td>Last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dangerous chemical</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>Last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In any of last 3 jobs, within last 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug production/sales-trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smuggling of contraband</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex B: Respondent driven and mark-recapture sampling

Quantitative studies

As detailed earlier, the RDS design commenced with the selection of 19 seeds. This gave rise to a final sample of size 600. Figure 1 presents a network visual illustration of the sample; the illustration is obtained with the aid of the `igraph' package (Csardi and Nepusz, 2006). Figure 2 presents the tree-like structure of the RDS sample; the illustration is obtained with the aid of the `RDS' package (Handcock et al., 2017). Table 1 provides the distribution of tree sizes. Notice the difference in size of the RDS trees, a result of implementing the RDS procedure in two stages.

![Sample Network Graph](image)

**Table 1: Distribution of tree size.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree 1</th>
<th>Tree 2</th>
<th>Tree 3</th>
<th>Tree 4</th>
<th>Tree 5</th>
<th>Tree 6</th>
<th>Tree 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The self-reported network size is required for RDS inferential purposes; see Gile (2011) for more information. The figure below gives a histogram of the network sizes of the respondents. In order to mitigate the influence of extreme weights, a Winsorizing technique (Rivest, 1994) was used to truncate the network sizes at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. After Winsorizing, all network size responses fell within 1 to 30, inclusive.
An estimate for the study population size is also required for RDS inference. Based on a recent study by Frederick et al. (2010), their reported estimate was 4250. Therefore, this value was used in the RDS analysis.

The sampling weights based on the successive sampling approach, as detailed by Gile (2011), were used for the RDS analysis. The figures below give a histogram of the sampling weights and a scatterplot of the weights by network size.

Figure 3: Histogram of network sizes of respondents.

Figure 5: Histogram of Gile's SS weights. Note that the weights sum to the assumed population size of 4,250.
A method to estimate the population size based solely on an RDS sample is detailed in (Handcock et al., 2015, 2014). This approach is based on a Bayesian framework and assumes a successive sampling design can approximate the true sample selection procedure. The `sspse` package (Handcock and Gile, 2017) was used to obtain the corresponding estimate. With a prior distribution of 4000, the resulting posterior mean and median respectively are 1368 and 1321, and the corresponding 95 percent probability interval is (1052, 2042). It is noted here that, since the RDS design is not based on steering incentives, this estimate is better suited to approximate those individuals in the population that are amongst the most well-connected in the network graph.
Annex C: Youth interview protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer’s name:</th>
<th>Respondent’s Serial Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Respondent’s Recruiting Serial Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Study Recruitment method:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks for volunteering to talk to me. Some of the questions may feel personal – just remember you can always say you don’t want to answer a question and we can move on to the next one. And remember your answers will not be given to ANYONE with information that someone could use to figure out who you are. Just a reminder, we will only be asking you about your past experiences; we don’t want to know about anything you intend to do in the future.

For the purposes of this interview, I will refer to you as [UNIQUE ID] so that your responses remain completely anonymous.

Demographic Characteristics

1. How old are you?
2. What’s your gender? (man, woman, transgender woman, transgender man?)
3. What is your religion?
4. What is your caste?
5. How many years did you finish in school?
6. When did you last go to school?
7. Where are you from (village, district, etc.)?
8. What is your marital status?
9. Do you have any children? If so, how many?
10. Where do you currently live – I am not asking for the address or neighborhood, just the type of place you live (e.g. family home, streets, work)?
   Who else do you live with? I don’t want their names, just to know if it’s family, friends, roommates, other residents, etc.
   How long have you lived there?
11. Do you have any siblings? If so, how many?
12. What type of work do your parents do?

Work History

The next questions are about your work history:

13. Please briefly describe all of the places you have worked in your life.
   a. What work are you currently doing?
14. What are the main reasons you started working outside the home?
15. What activities has your work entailed?
16. How old were you when you first started doing this type of work?
17. How did you find out about this work? (e.g.: recruiter, village middle-man, friend, neighbor, etc)

18. Did you migrate to the Kathmandu Valley area for this work?
   a. If yes, how did you get to this job?
   b. Did anyone accompany you from your village?
   c. Did you or your family have to pay a fee for you to get this job?
   d. What work were you told you were going to do?
   e. What wage were you promised? Were you promised any other job benefits (e.g. housing, time off, education, etc.)?
   f. What happened when you arrived at the work site?

19. Did you accept this job in order to pay off a loan or advance?
   a. If yes, how much was the loan for?
   b. Who was the loan/advance for?
   c. What was the loan/advance for?

20. Was it your decision to take this job?
   a. If yes, why did you decide to take the job?
   b. If no, please describe the circumstances under which this decision was made for you.
      i. What would have happened if you refused to take the job?

Current Work Situation

21. Please describe your current work and working conditions (Prompts: work hours, number of days per week worked, living conditions, meals provided, breaks provided, activities performed)

22. How long have you worked at this worksite?

23. How many other people work at this worksite?
   a. Please describe your employer(s) and co-workers (Prompts: age, gender, caste, job duties)

24. Approximately how much money per week do you make?
   a. What other forms of payment do you receive for work (e.g. in-kind non cash payment – specify what type, debt repayment, etc.)
   b. Do you receive payment in the form of tips directly from client? If so, on average how much per client?

25. Do you keep all the money you earn?
   a. If yes, how do you spend the money (if at all)?
   b. If no, describe who gets the money and how much they get.

26. Do you ever feel pressured to work even when you do not want to?
27. What would happen if you tried to leave your job without permission?

28. Has anyone ever left the job without permission?
   a. If yes, what happened?

29. Have you ever been injured at work? If so, please describe what happened.

30. Has anyone at work (e.g. employer, co-worker, client) ever asked you to engage in intimate activities?
   a. If yes, how long had you worked at the job before they asked you to do this?
b. Were you expecting this to be part of the job?

c. Were you able to refuse? If not, what would happen if you did?

d. Were you expected to engage in these activities regularly as part of your job or was it just once/a handful of times?

e. Did someone train you to engage in these activities? If yes, who?

f. How many clients do you see in a week? Of these clients how many do you engage in intimate activities with?

g. Who decides what prices are charged?

h. Where do you go with your clients?

Experiences of Abuse

31. Have you ever been abused while at work?
   a. If yes, what kind of abuse did you suffer (e.g. physical, emotional, verbal, psychological, financial)?
   b. Who abused you? (e.g. employer, client, co-worker, etc.)
   c. Have you ever told anyone about the abuse?
      i. If yes, what happened?
      ii. If no, why not?
   d. How do you protect yourself (if at all)?

32. Are you able to leave the worksite when you want?

33. Are you able to freely communicate with friends, family, etc.?

34. What kinds of abuse do other young people in similar work situations experience?

Help-Seeking

35. Do you know of any organizations you could approach for help if your employer was treating you wrongly? Have you ever contacted such an organization? If not, why?

36. Did you ever try to approach the local police while working there?
   a. If yes, please describe what happened
   b. If not, why not?

Last Thoughts

37. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me or discuss that you believe would be important for this study
Annex D: Kathmandu Valley AES survey

INFORMED CONSENT

Hello my name is________________, and I am working for New Era

Q1.1 CONSENT / ASSENT FORM FOR SURVEYS

NOTE TO INTERVIEWERS: Please read this form to potential respondents and offer the respondents the opportunity to review it themselves prior to beginning the survey.

A. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY You are invited to help us do a research study of youth who work in the adult entertainment sector in Kathmandu Valley. We hope that the information we learn from young people like you will help people understand some of the problems that you and others in your situation face, and can make better decisions about how to help you deal with these problems. We also hope the information will help provide services and assistance in ways that will make things better not worse for you. This study is being done by researchers from John Jay College in New York City (U.S) and New Era in Kathmandu.

I want to start by giving you some information that can help you make a good choice about joining or not joining the study. If you: (i) Work in the adult entertainment sector in the Kathmandu Valley, and (ii) you are between the ages 12-21, then you qualify to participate in this study. Do these things describe you?

B. PROCEDURES If you agree to be a part of the study, then I am going to ask you some questions about young people who work in the adult entertainment sector in Kathmandu Valley. You can decide not to answer any question I ask you at any time for any reason. If you don’t want to answer a question, we can move on to the next one. If you decide at any time that you want to stop answering questions, that’s fine too. It might take about 30 or 40 minutes to complete this survey. Deciding not to answer a question or to stop answering any questions won’t have any impact on our relationship, on getting referrals, or getting services anywhere. Since we are interested in surveying people like yourself who know about youth who work in the adult entertainment sector after your survey, we will explain how you can help us recruit other people to participate in the study.

We are also doing interviews with some participants. I will tell you more about that later. If you don’t want to be a part of the study, we can stop now. If you don’t want to talk with us, you can stop at any time.

C. PRIVACY STATEMENT Your participation in this study is private and confidential. No one will know that you gave the answers you give us today – we’ll document what you say, but we’ll just give you a number that we will put next to your answers. No one except me will know that you are the person who said what you tell us today. Keep in mind that we will only be asking you about your past experiences; we DO NOT want to know about anything you intend to do in the future. When we share the results of our research, we won’t do it in a way that would let someone who reads it figure out who you are.

D. COMPENSATION To pay your for your time in answering questions, we will provide you with 400NRs at the end of the survey. If you agree to participate in helping the project recruit additional people to survey, you will be provided with 200 NRs for each eligible person (up to three youth) that you recruit who completes the survey.

E. RISKS There are minimal risks from being in this study, but our questions are very personal, and might bring stuff up for you, or feel hard to answer. You might get tired of answering our questions.
Remember, you can say you don’t want to answer a particular question, and we’ll just move on. You can also stop the survey at any time. Let us know if there is anything you need to feel more comfortable, or if you feel stressed out or want help dealing with something that comes up for you. There might be some risk that someone could find out that you are participating in this research, and this might cause trouble for you. Everything you tell us will be kept private and confidential. You can skip any questions or stop the survey at any time. Your responses will not be given to the police or anyone else. We will connect you with organizations and agencies that might be able to help you if you feel unsafe.

F. REFERRALS We have a list of organizations and agencies that might be able offer help with lots of things, including health and counseling. We can’t guarantee that they will give you what you need, but we can tell you what they say they might be able do for you. We are happy to give you as much information about the services that are out there as you want or need. If you want us to take you to one of the places that can offer you help, we will do that. We can give you this information even if you decide not to be in this research study.

One reason we are doing this study is to help organizations and agencies learn more about what young people in your situation need and how to better to help you deal with the problems that you and young people like you face.

G. QUESTIONS? This study is run by {New Era – Insert appropriate name and contact info}. Her phone number is X. You can call her with any questions about what you tell us today, the study, or about the research results. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or if you want to talk to someone other than the researchers, you can contact the CUNY Research Compliance Administrator at 646-664-8918 or HRPP@cuny.edu.

H. AGREEMENT Do you agree to participate in the study?

Q1.2 Do you agree to participate in the study?
   o Yes (1)
   o No (2)

A. Survey Administrative Records

Q2.1 District

Q2.2 Village

Q2.3 Location (work site name)

Q2.4 Initials of interviewer

Q2.5 Date of Interview

Q2.6 Start time of survey
B. Referral Source

Q3.1 What is your age?
________________________________________________________________
Skip To: End of Survey If What is your age? >= 22

Q3.2 Have you been working outside the home in the past 12 months?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Have you been working outside the home in the past 12 months? = No

Q3.3 Where have you worked in the past 12 months? (Adult Entertainment Sector) Check all that apply

- Dance Bar (1)
- Dohori (2)
- Apartment (3)
- Massage Parlor (4)
- Cabin Restaurant (5)
- Khaja Ghar/Bhatti Pasal (6)
- Streets (7)
- Hotel/Guest Houses (8)
- Other: (9) ________________________________________________
- None of the Above (10)

Skip To: End of Survey If Where have you worked in the past 12 months? (Adult Entertainment Sector) Check all that apply = None of the Above

Q3.4 Have you previously talked to one of our team staff?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Have you previously talked to one of our team staff? = Yes

Q3.5 Coupon Number

________________________________________________________________

Q3.6 Coupon Number of Person Who Referred You

________________________________________________________________

Q3.7 How do you know the person who referred you?
________________________________________________________________

C. Demographic Profile

Q4.1 How Do You Identify Your Gender?

- Female (1)
- Male (2)
Q4.2 What is your marital status?
- Never married (1)
- Currently married (2)
- Widowed (3)
- Separated (4)
- Divorced (5)
- Other (6) ________________________________________________

Q4.3 Do You Have Any Children?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: Q4.5 If Do You Have Any Children? = No

Q4.4 How many children do you have?
________________________________________________________________

Q4.5 Are you currently attending school?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q4.6 What is the highest grade you completed in school?
- 1st-12th Standard (1) ____________________________________________
- No education (2)
- Literate/No Formal Education (3)
- Other (4) ____________________________________________________

Q4.7 What is your religion?
- Hindu (1)
- Muslim (2)
- Christian (3)
- Buddhist (4)
- Other (5) ____________________________________________________

Q4.8 What is your caste/ethnicity?
- Tamang (1)
- Brahmin/Chhetri (2)
- Magar (3)
- Rai (4)
- Newar (5)
- Tharu/Majhi/Pariyar (6)
- Other (specify) (7) ____________________________________________

Q4.9 Is this your native town (where the interview is taking place)?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Block If Is this your native town (where the interview is taking place)? = Yes

Q4.10 What is your native country?
________________________________________________________________
Q4.11 What is your native state?
________________________________________________________________

Q4.12 What district are you from?
________________________________________________________________

Q4.13 What town/village are you from?
________________________________________________________________

D. Work History

Q5.1 What are the main reasons why you started working outside the home?
________________________________________________________________

Q5.2 What activities do you do at work (check all that apply)?
☐ Cleaning venue, tables, dishes (1)
☐ Preparing food or cooking (2)
☐ Taking food/drink orders, waitressing (3)
☐ Selling or serving alcohol (4)
☐ Sitting with clients (5)
☐ Singing, dancing, performing (6)
☐ Hostessing (7)
☐ Massaging (8)
☐ Flirting, kissing, or physical intimacy (9)
☐ Other (specify) (10) _____________________________________________________________________

Q5.3 How old were you when you FIRST stated doing this type of work?
________________________________
________________________________

Q5.4 Who introduced or pressured you into doing this type of work? (Choose all that apply)
☐ Father (1)
☐ Mother (2)
☐ Sibling (3)
☐ Cousins (4)
☐ Other older relatives (uncle/aunts) (5)
☐ Friends (6)
☐ Partner (e.g. boyfriend or husband) (7)
☐ Pimp (8)
☐ Business associates (people you work with) (9)
☐ In-laws (10)
☐ Neighbors (11)
☐ Other (12) _____________________________________________________________________

Q5.5 Was it to pay off a loan or advance wage?
☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Skip To: Q5.8 If Was it to pay off a loan or advance wage? = No
Q5.6 Who was the loan/advance wage for?
- Yourself (1)
- Your family (2)
- Someone else (3)

Q5.7 What was the loan/advance wage for?
________________________________________________________________

Q5.8 The first time you did this work, was it your own decision?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: Q5.9 If The first time you did this work, was it your own decision? = Yes
Skip To: Q5.10 If The first time you did this work, was it your own decision? = No

Q5.9 What was your reason?
________________________________________________________________

Skip To: End of Block If What was your reason? Is Not Empty

Q5.10 If it wasn't your decision, were you offered another job and then tricked into doing this work?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: Q5.11 If If it wasn't your decision, were you offered another job and then tricked into doing this work? = Yes
Skip To: Q5.12 If If it wasn't your decision, were you offered another job and then tricked into doing this work? = No

Q5.11 What job were you initially offered?
________________________________________________________________

Q5.12 What would have happened to you if you had refused at the time? (choose all that apply)
- Physical violence (including being punched, kicked, dragged, beaten up, threatened with a gun, knife or other weapons) (1)
- Physically restrained (including being tied up or locked in a room) (2)
- Deprived of food, water and/or sleep (3)
- Sexual violence (an act that is sexual in nature, including physical contact, being photographed or forced to watch other sexual acts) (4)
- Emotional violence (including belittling or ostracizing a person in front of their peers/verbal abuse) (5)
- Harm to a family member(s) or someone you care about (6)
- Legal action (including being arrested) (7)
- Withholding of ID cards/citizenship (8)
- Loss of wages (9)
- Confiscation of savings or other valuables (10)
- Too far from the home and nowhere to go (11)
- Kept drunk/drugged (12)
- No better job options (13)
- Restrictions in communication (14)
- Nothing would have happened to me (18)
- Other (15) ___________________________________________________________
E. Current Work Situation

Q5.13 On average, what time do you start work (use 24 hour format)?

Q5.14 On average, what time do you end work (use 24 hour format)?

Q5.15 On average, how many hours do you work in a day?

Q5.16 On average, how many days a week do you work?

Q5.17 How long have you worked at the work site? (answer in months)

Q5.18 How many other people work at this work site (adults and minors)?

Q5.19 How many other people under the age of 18 (boys or girls) work at this work site?

Q5.20 In a typical week, how many clients do you provide services to?

Q5.21 Approximately how much did you earn in cash from your employer in the past month (except tips)?

Q5.22 What is the form of payment for this work? (Check all that apply)

☐ None (1)
☐ Cash (2)
☐ In kind (non-cash payment) (3)
☐ In kind (food only) (4)
☐ Debt repayment (5)
☐ Other (6) ______________________________________________________

Q5.23 Approximately how much did you earn in tips from customers in the past month?

Q5.24 Do you keep all the money you earn?

☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)
Skip To: Q5.27 If Do you keep all the money you earn? = Yes

Q5.25 What percent do you get to keep? (can write in % if easier)
_______________________________________________________________

Q5.26 Who gets the remaining money?
☐ Co-worker (1)
☐ Employer (2)
☐ Guardians (3)
☐ Partner (4)
☐ Other (5) ________________________________________________

Q5.27 Are you currently working to pay an advance wage or loan?
☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Skip To: Q5.29 If Are you currently working to pay an advance wage or loan? = No

Q5.28 When do you anticipate paying off your loans/debt? (answer in months)
☐ Never (1)
☐ Other (2) ________________________________________________
☐ Don't know (3)

Q5.29 Are you free to change employers?
☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Skip To: End of Block If Are you free to change employers? = Yes

Q5.30 What would happen to you if you tried to change employers? (Check all that apply)
☐ Physical violence (including being punched, kicked, dragged, beaten up, threatened with a gun, knife or other weapons) (1)
☐ Physically restrained (including being tied up or locked in a room) (2)
☐ Deprived of food, water, and/or sleep (3)
☐ Sexual violence (any act that is sexual in nature, including physical contact, being photographed or forced to watch other sexual acts) (4)
☐ Emotional violence (including belittling or ostracizing a person in front of their peers)/verbal abuse (5)
☐ Harm to family or someone you care about (6)
☐ Legal action (including being arrested) (7)
☐ Withholding of ID cards (8)
☐ Loss of Wages (9)
☐ Confiscation of Savings or Other Valuables (20)
☐ Too far from home and nowhere to go (10)
☐ Kept drunk/drugged (11)
☐ No better job options (12)
☐ Nothing would happen to me (16)
☐ Other (13) ________________________________________________
☐ Refused to answer (14)
☐ Don't know (15)
F. Restriction of Freedom

Q5.31 Now I would like to as you some questions about how you are treated at work. If anyone interrupts us I will change the topic of conversation. I would like to assure you that your answers will be kept secret, and that you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to. May I continue?

Q5.32 Have any of the following incidents ever happened to you at work?

Have any of the following incidents ever happened to you at work? If yes, at which work site? When was the last time this happened to you at work? How many times in the last month has this happened to you at work? (Enter 0 for none and 1111 for all of the time)

Yes (1) No (2) Primary (1) Secondary (2) Month (1) Year (2) # of times (1)
You were forbidden from leaving the work site (1)
You were restricted on where you could go during non-work hours? (2)
You were prevented or restricted from communicating freely with your family, including making or receiving phone calls to/from them? (3)
You were not permitted to seek or receive medical services when you fell ill? (4)
Have you ever been forced to work when you refused? (5)

Q5.33 If you had been forced to work when you refused, what happened when you refused? (check all that apply)

☐ Physical violence (including being punched, kicked dragged, beaten up, threatened with a gun, knife or other weapons) (1)
☐ Physically restrained (including being tied up or locked in a room) (2)
☐ Deprived of food, water and/or sleep (3)
☐ Sexual violence (any act that is sexual in nature, including physical contact, being photographed or forced to watch other sexual acts) (4)
☐ Emotional violence (including belittling or ostracizing a person in front of their peers)/verbal abuse (5)
☐ Harm to family or someone you care about (6)
☐ Legal action (including being arrested) (7)
☐ Withholding of ID cards (8)
☐ Loss of wages (9)
☐ Confiscation of savings and other valuables (17)
☐ Too far from home and nowhere to go (10)
☐ Kept drunk/drugged (11)
☐ No better job options (12)
☐ Nothing would have happened (13)
☐ Other (14) ________________________________________________
☐ Refused (15)
☐ Don't know (16)

G. Experience of Emotional/Physical/Sexual Violence

Q5.34 Have any of the following incidents happened to you at work? Yes (1) No (2)

Has this ever happened to you? Yes (1) No (2)
If yes, who was the perpetrator? Employer (1) Clients (2) Both (3)
When was the last time this happened to you? Month (1) Year (2)
How many times in the last 6 months has this happened? # of times (1)

Deducted your wages against your will? (1)
Intimidated you by shouting at your or smashing things? (2)
Threatened to hurt your family or someone you care about? (3)
Punched, kicked, dragged or beaten you up? (4)
Threatened you with a gun, knife or other weapons? (5)
Forced you to drink alcohol or use illegal drugs? (6)
Does anyone at work make you kiss, cuddle or perform intimate touching? (7)
Does anyone at work make you talk, joke or flirt verbally? (8)
Does anyone at work make you dance erotically? (9)
Does anyone at work make you give sensual massages? (10)
Does anyone at work make you watch pornography? (11)
Does anyone at work make you perform oral, vaginal or anal sex? (12)
Does anyone at work make you perform any other kind of intimate activity? If yes, what? (13)

Skip To: End of Block If Have any of the following incidents happened to you at work? = Intimidated you by shouting at your or smashing things?

Q5.35 (If they said yes to any of the above) You mentioned some of these bad things happened to you, did you stay at the job?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Block If (If they said yes to any of the above) You mentioned some of these bad things happened to you, di... = No

Q5.36 Why did you stay at the job? (Please check all that apply)
- Physical violence (including being punched, kicked, dragged, beaten up, threatened with a gun, knife or other weapons) (1)
- Physically restrained (including being tied up or locked in a room) (2)
- Deprived of food, water and/or sleep (3)
- Sexual violence (any act that is sexual in nature, including physical contact, being photographed or forced to watch other sexual acts) (4)
- Emotional violence (including belittling or ostracizing a person in front of their peers)/verbal abuse (5)
- Harm to family or someone you care about (6)
- Legal action (including being arrested) (7)
- Withholding of ID cards (8)
- Loss of wages (9)
- Confiscation of savings or other valuables (17)
- Too far from home and nowhere to go (10)
- Kept drunk/drugged (11)
- No better job options (12)
- Nothing would have happened (13)
- Other (14)
- Refused to answer (15)
- Don't know (16)

H. Referrals

Q5.37 This is the end of the survey. Thank you very much for taking the time to participate in this study. Now please help us find more people to participate in this study.

Q5.39 How many girls/boys do you personally know by name/alias who have worked in the adult entertainment sector in the last 12 months?

________________________________________________________________

Q5.40 Do you know of any girls and boys who are kept by their facilitators/employers and never hang out with
other youth like you in the adult entertainment sector?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: Q5.42 If Do you know of any girls and boys who are kept by their facilitators/employers and never hang out... = No

Q5.41 How many youth do you know? (Enter 0 for none)

Q5.42 Can you nominate FIVE of these friends you know so we can talk to them? (Approach THREE to complete the survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (alias)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Where are they from (location)</th>
<th>Other attributes that help us know them better</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer 1 (1)</td>
<td>Answer 1 (1)</td>
<td>Answer 1 (1)</td>
<td>Answer 1 (1)</td>
<td>Answer 1 (1)</td>
<td>Answer 1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. To Be Completed After the Interview (To be filled out by the INTERVIEWER)

Q6.1 Finish time of the survey (24-hour format):

Q6.2 Were you able to complete the survey?
- Yes, interview was completed (1)
- Yes, interview was completed but in the presence of others (2)
- No, interview was not completed because the respondent refused to answer all the questions (3)
- No, interview was not completed because interrupted (4)
- No, other (5) _______________

Q6.3 Did the respondent request help from the interviewer related to their safety or potential abuse?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Skip To: End of Block If Did the respondent request help from the interviewer related to their safety or potential abuse? = No

Q6.5 Was the interview influenced by any observer?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

End of Block: I. To Be Completed After the Interview (To be filled out by the INTERVIEWER)
Annex E: Kathmandu Valley survey spread map
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