

We are pleased to share this information with you and encourage you to use these documents for research purposes. Please ensure that all credits are acknowledged when using all or any of the information in these documents. Commercial reproduction is strictly prohibited.

The UNICEF Juvenile Justice Indicator Project and the Field-test in the Philippines

Alberto T. Muyot, UNICEF-Manila

Why develop juvenile justice indicators?

- To compare progress of countries in protection of children in conflict with the law/administration of juvenile justice
- Having standardized indicators makes it easier to monitor progress and to have dialogue
- Measuring things makes them visible, and makes progress more likely

What are the indicators?

- Proportion of children in conflict with the law held in detention and proportion held pre-sentence
- Existence of specialized juvenile justice system
- Outcomes of contact with the juvenile justice system
- Number of child deaths in custody and causes of death

What are the indicators?

- Existence of a system guaranteeing regular visits by independent bodies
- Duration of detention and average length of pre-sentence detention
- Existence of complaint mechanisms for children deprived of their liberty
- Proportion of children in detention who are not separated from adults

What are the indicators?

- Existence of a national programme for the prevention of juvenile delinquency
- Proportion of children released from detention benefiting from an aftercare program
- Proportion of children in detention who have been visited by parents or family members in the last 3 months
- Distribution of juvenile justice budget on custody vs. community disposals

How might they be used?

- For reporting guidelines for countries submitting CRC implementation reports
- For monitoring and systems improvements
- For advocacy and awareness raising
- For research and publications

What are the lessons learned from the field-test in the Philippines?

- The terms used in the global indicators would have to be adapted to the terminology formally and informally used in the particular country
- Information provided by the service providers can be validated through interviews of the detained children
- A lengthy questionnaire often results in the reporting of low quality data

What are the lessons learned from the field-test in the Philippines?

- Self-administered questionnaires do not produce good quality answers
- Answering the survey questionnaires gave the respondents guidance on how to improve the conditions of institutions and those of the children under custody

What are the obstacles that have to be overcome?

- There is a poor system of data collection and management in many institutions
- The corrections system in the Philippines is fragmented; children in conflict with the law are detained in different categories of institutions operated by different government agencies

What are the opportunities?

- Great interest from both government and civil society in improving systems
- Good relations between government and NGOs on children's rights
- Information management systems exist in the national government agencies and in some institutions, although use is not maximized

What are the opportunities?

- There is a government agency that is ready and able to make good use of the information
- Indicators can be integrated into UNICEF's DevInfo system