ANNEX I – STATEMENT OF WORK AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) to which the Philippines is a State Party contains policies and other measures that address issues confronting children in conflict with the law (CICL). Specifically, the Convention provides that CICL should take into account the child’s age, the desirability of promoting the child’s reintegration, and the child assuming a constructive role in society. Crucial to realizing this is a juvenile justice system that puts detention as a last resort for children who are alleged as, accused of, adjudged, or recognized as having infringed the penal law. An intervention and rehabilitation program that aims to restore the child to the mainstream and prevent re-offending is equally important.

The Philippine legal framework on CICL traces its origin to the 1974 Child and Youth Welfare Code (Presidential Decree No. 603). The Code outlines the procedures for the care and treatment of CICL, earlier known as youth offenders, and introduces the concept of suspension of sentence and commitment to the care and custody of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). The Code mandates DSWD to establish and maintain regional rehabilitation centers for CICL. More than thirty (30) years thereafter, Republic Act No. 9344, also known as the Juvenile and Justice and Welfare Act of 2006 was enacted, establishing a more comprehensive juvenile justice and welfare system in the Philippines and introducing the concept of restorative justice and diversion. The law takes into account the principles contained in the CRC and other international instruments relating to the protection of the rights and the promotion of the welfare of CICL. The law likewise creates the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Council (JJWC), in which DSWD is the head, as an inter-agency body responsible for coordinating the implementation of R.A. No. 9344.

In addition, the law reiterates the primary responsibility of DSWD to establish and maintain the Regional Rehabilitation Centres for Youth (RRCY) in each region of the country. It is also responsible for providing technical assistance to LGUs in the development of community-based programs for intervention, diversion, and rehabilitation. The RRCY is a facility designed to provide intensive treatment in a residential setting for children in conflict with the law who are under suspended sentence. DSWD operates and maintains 15 RRCYs and one centre for female CICL in the National Capital Region (NCR) known as Marillac Hills.

A few local government units (LGUs) likewise run homes for CICL such as the Molave Youth Home in Quezon City and the Pasay City Youth Home. Through congressional development funding, DSWD oversees the establishment of Bahay
Pag-asa, a 24-hour residential facility cum rehabilitation center that provides temporary care to a maximum of 25 disadvantaged male children, including CICL, at any given time. The centers provide protection, care, training, and rehabilitation for children in a home-like environment for a maximum of six months. These centers were established in several LGUs.

As mentioned earlier, R.A. No. 9344 introduces diversion as a measure for CICL to avoid contact with the formal judicial processes. Diversion may be undertaken at the barangay level, during a police investigation, during an inquest or preliminary investigation, or by the court. Diversion is available for CICL who commit offenses with imposable penalty of not more than six years of imprisonment. For offenses with imposable penalty of six years and more, diversion may still be applicable but only by the courts and prior to arraignment. A diversion program is developed taking into consideration a number of factors, and agreed upon by all concerned parties including the victims, if any. Diversion programs are in a number of forms including sociocultural and psychological responses and services, but all aim for the child’s rehabilitation and reformation.

UNICEF Philippines supported the drafting and advocacy for the passage of RA No. 9344 and other programs to promote the appropriate handling of children in conflict with the law. UNICEF worked with DSWD to support the drafting of DSWD Administrative Order No.10, series of 2007 on the Guidelines for Social Workers on the Handling and Treatment of Children in Conflict with the Law, and DSWD Administrative Order No.7, Series of 2008 on the Guidelines for the Conduct of Diversion for Children in Conflict with the Law. During the 6th cycle of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP 2006-2011), UNICEF also supported the improvement of various DSWD and LGU operated centers and institutions for children in conflict with the law by supporting the capacity building for social workers and house parents on how to handle the children, and also providing supplies and equipment which can be used for conducting activities with the children in the centers, such as sports equipment and tools and equipment for technical and vocational skills training (i.e. carpentry, welding, etc.).

Since 2000, there have been significant developments in the child protection legal framework that impact DSWD’s mandates and responsibilities. Among these are the passage of laws providing protection to victims of trafficking in persons, worst forms of child labor, child pornography and child prostitution, and CICL. These laws require the delivery of psychosocial care and assistance, whether undertaken in institutions or at the community level. Of particular concern is the care and treatment of CICL, especially those who are under a diversion program and those who are on suspended sentence. These laws have expanded the roles and responsibilities of DSWD as well as local governments which may have impacted the quality of intervention programs and the manner of delivering services to CICL. There have been discussions and debates on the readiness of welfare institutions and local governments to meet the rehabilitation and reintegration needs of CICL and the effectiveness of interventions and services. Some have questioned the efficacy of the Juvenile and Justice and Welfare Act, especially its inability to prevent re-offending and recidivism among CICL, that Congress sought amendments of the present law. The congressional bicameral committee finally agreed on contentious and conflicting provisions between the versions of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The amendments further call for an enhanced and intensified programs and services for CICL especially those who commit heinous or serious offenses. Interestingly, these interventions are those that are provided in residential facilities.

Previous studies (Hoffman 2002; DSWD 2004) on DSWD centres and institutions for children shed light on a number of interrelated issues, such as capacity of existing facilities to fulfil the current service delivery objectives of the Department; management and operations of these residential facilities; policy and standards; and service delivery quality and responsiveness. However, there has not been any evaluation done on the effects of the rehabilitation and intervention program of the RRCYs. Meanwhile, the UP Law Centre Institute of Government has jointly conducted a research with DSWD on the local government compliance with the CICL law. Findings show that there is a low level of compliance in the local governments covered by the research, attributing it to factors such as financial constraints, lack of personnel,
lack of knowledge, and lack of training on R.A. No. 9344. No evaluation, however, has been done yet on the implementation of diversion programs at various levels since the law took effect. The study conducted by UP recommends looking into the implementation of existing diversion programs towards identifying effective diversion models.

It is, therefore, strategic to examine at this point, through an independent evaluation process, the centre-based and diversion programs for CICL and how these contribute to the overall objectives of juvenile justice and welfare administration. A fresher look into these programs and services will pave the way for a more current picture which could eventually feed into policy reform and program enhancement.

The results of this evaluation will be used by DSWD and UNICEF in refocusing, redeveloping, or improving its center-based programs and services for CICL as well as in improving accreditation standards for CICL programs of facilities operated and managed by LGUs and non-government organizations. It will also strategically interface with the ongoing efforts of the JJWC to implement the Comprehensive National Juvenile Intervention Program at the local level.

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will be mainly used to enhance the understanding of DSWD as well as local governments and UNICEF on what services and interventions work and what do not work for CICL who are under suspended sentence, discernment assessment, or diversion programs. It also aims to provide evidence for policy reform and program development or enhancement towards contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the juvenile justice and welfare system of the country.

The primary users of the findings and conclusions of this evaluation will be the relevant units of DSWD such as the Policy Development and Planning Bureau (PDPB), Protective Services Bureau (PSB), Social Technology Bureau (STB), and Standards Bureau (SB), the social welfare and development offices at the local government units, NGO implementing partners, and UNICEF.

These different units of DSWD coordinate with each other in developing, pilot-testing, and monitoring policies and programs as well as accreditation standards. The results of this evaluation will be endorsed by the DSWD Undersecretary in charge of policy and program to the appropriate units. Such units shall review policy recommendations and/or prepare the proposed guidelines in response to the recommendations. For instance, this evaluation may recommend specific policy reforms; hence, the PDPB will develop proposed policy guidelines in consultation with other relevant DSWD units. If the recommendations require adjustment in standards for center-based facilities, the SB will make the necessary changes in national standards.

The policies and standards arising from this evaluation will be likewise relevant for the Social Welfare and Development Office of local governments as they supervise the operations and maintenance of local facilities. Such evaluation results also matter to the administrators of the RRCY and those of LGU- or NGO-run facilities. The conduct of this evaluation likewise supports the mandate of JJWC to conduct continuing researches and studies on matters relating to juvenile justice and welfare, especially on related programs and services seeking to respond to the needs of CICL. The findings of this evaluation will also be relevant to the JJWC, especially in the implementation of the Comprehensive National Juvenile Intervention Program at the local level.

For UNICEF, the evaluation findings will be used to strengthen UNICEF’s strategy on CICL and the corresponding programs and projects for priority local government units.
3. **SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The general objective of the evaluation is to determine which programs/services/practices are the most relevant and effective in implementing diversion programs and meeting the rehabilitation and reintegration needs of children in conflict with the law.

The evaluation has the following specific objectives:

1. Assess the center-based rehabilitation programs and services, and intervention programmes of the Regional Rehabilitation and Youth Centers (RRYC) of DSWD supported by UNICEF;

2. Assess existing community-based intervention and diversion programs at various levels (i.e. barangay, police, prosecutor) and the processes and mechanisms for implementing and monitoring such programs, including those assisted by UNICEF;

3. Determine the capacity of local government social workers in assessing CICL’s ability to discern committal of an offense, and use this as basis for identifying support to improve their knowledge, attitude, and skills including UNICEF support to the capacity building of LGUs;

4. Identify and document good practices and extract general lessons learned in current approaches and service delivery mechanisms for DSWD and UNICEF; and

Come up with concrete recommendations to address program implementation issues, constraints, and limitations as well as areas for policy and program enhancement for DSWD and UNICEF.

The evaluation will cover the Youth Rehabilitation Center of DSWD such as the RRCYs and Marillac Hills and UNICEF assisted centres and a few selected Bahay Pag-asa (Transition and Rehabilitation Home for Disadvantaged Children) managed by local governments. The evaluation will aim to cover all the 15 RRCYs of DSWD and about 10 of the Bahay Pag-asa. DSWD shall provide the list of the 10 Bahay Pag-asa that will be covered by this evaluation. In the event that such numbers could not be reached due to logistical constraints, the number, location, and selection of such facilities will be jointly undertaken by DSWD and UNICEF, taking into consideration the population of children currently being served, the geographical distribution between the major island groupings, and the number of CICL in the area where such facilities exist.

The evaluation will also cover the Youth Detention Home operated by a few local government units and non-government organizations such as the Molave Youth Home run by the local government of Quezon City; the Youth Home operated by the local government of Pasay City; and facilities operated by PREDA Foundation and Virlanie Foundation.

The DSWD will facilitate the identification and selection of the community-based intervention and diversion programmes which will be included in the evaluation. The selection will be limited to those which already form part of the referral system of the 15 RRCYs of the DSWD.

Groups of CICL to be covered

One key determinant to be analyzed in this evaluation is the quality of intervention and rehabilitation programs of residential facilities and diversion programs and how effective and efficient they are in reintegrating CICL and in
eventually reducing their re-offending. For this purpose, the evaluation will draw out the sample from the following groups:

a. CICL who were on suspended sentence and discharged by the court after disposition measures have been fulfilled;
b. CICL who are on suspended sentence and currently receiving interventions in DSWD or LGU residential facilities;
c. CICL who have been diverted from judicial proceedings and are undergoing a diversion program;
d. CICL who are 15 years of age at the time of the commission of an offense, thereby incurring no criminal liability, but have undergone an intervention program;
e. CICL who are above 15 but below 18 years of age and who have acted without discernment; and
f. CICL who are below 15 years and are undergoing community-based intervention and diversion programs.

CICL on 'suspended sentence' as used in this TOR shall mean those who have been formally charged in a proper court and are found guilty of committing an offense, but instead of pronouncing the judgment, their sentences are suspended and the court imposes other disposition measures such as commitment to a residential care facility for rehabilitation.

CICL under diversion, on the other hand, shall be defined as those who are diverted from judicial proceedings and are undergoing a diversion program following a contract of diversion through conferencing, mediation, and conciliation at the barangay level through the Katarungang Pambarangay or during a police investigation, or following a decision of a prosecutor or a judge.

Service providers to be covered

The evaluation will also cover the extent of technical support and training opportunities given to local social workers to enhance their capacity to undertake discernment assessment of CICL. Such assessment is crucial in determining whether the CICL, 15 years old but below 18, will be exempt from criminal liability and be subjected to an intervention program, or shall be formally charged in court. The evaluation will include social workers in the RRCY, LGU, and NGO. Please refer to the Annex 01 for additional guidance on the existing Administrative orders and law passed for this program.

Time frame

The evaluation will cover the seven-year period from the time R.A. No. 9344 was approved (2006) until May 2013. During this period, there have been a lot of policies and measures put in place to comply with the requirements of the law.

Evaluation questions

Key evaluation questions shall be as follows:

a) Impact

- To what extent have the intervention and rehabilitation programs and diversion contributed to facilitating social reintegration of CICL?
- To what extent have these programs reduced re-offending or recidivism among CICL?
Are there any external factors (risks and assumptions) that have affected the impact of the programs? Are the factors, if any, sufficiently taken into consideration in adjusting the design of the programs?

To what extent have the programs (residential and diversion) led to making CICL productive members of the community or improved their lives after receiving services and interventions?

**b) Relevance**

- How relevant are DSWD, LGU and NGO center-based, and UNICEF assisted intervention and rehabilitation programs in meeting the needs of CICL?
- How relevant are the existing diversion programs? Is diversion widely resorted to at various levels (barangay, police, prosecution, and court)? Are diversion programs available and accessible at such levels?
- To what extent are the programs (residential and diversion) implemented/supported by DSWD and UNICEF relevant or contribute to the overall national juvenile justice and welfare policy framework and to the broader rule of law and justice sector reform agenda implemented in the Philippines?
- To what extent have the programs (residential and diversion) implemented/supported by DSWD and UNICEF complied with the standards of the CRC and other international instruments relating to CICL (Beijing Rules, Riyadh Guidelines, etc.)?
- How relevant are the centre-based intervention and rehabilitation programs to UNICEF’s overall response to emergencies and the Child Protection programme?

**c) Effectiveness**

- To what extent and how have the expected results of the programs (residential and diversion) been achieved? To what extent have DSWD and UNICEF been able to influence the effective delivery of intervention and rehabilitation programs in facilities managed or operated by LGUs and NGOs?
- Are there external factors that have influenced positively or negatively the rehabilitation and reintegration of CICL?
- What are the major constraints and limitations in the delivery of programs? What are the facilitating factors?
- To what extent have the programs contributed to the effectiveness of UNICEF’s Child Protection programme?

**d) Efficiency**

- Are there sufficient human and financial resources invested in the intervention and rehabilitation programs? How about in diversion programs?
- How efficiently managed and coordinated are the resources?
- To what extent has DSWD and UNICEF been able to influence the efficient delivery of intervention and rehabilitation programs in facilities managed or operated by LGUs and NGOs?
- What interventions and services are the most efficient in meeting the needs of CICL?

**e) Sustainability**

- To what extent have the local governments embraced the mandate of establishing youth homes and committed to sustain operations and implementation of center-based programs?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL 14 RFP [Reference Number]
Book G: Chapter 7, Section 9 – Procurement of services

unicef

- To what extent have DSWD and LGUs enhanced their capacity to sustain the implementation of the programs (residential and diversion)?
- To what extent have systems been put in place to ensure sustainability?

f) Cross-cutting

- To what extent are sex and age disaggregated data collected and monitored?
- To what degree have the programs responded to the inclusion of girls and boys to participate in the design, delivery, and monitoring of activities?

Deliverables for the Conduct of the Assessment

The Consulting group shall deliver the following:

1. Inception Report;
2. A complete first draft evaluation report; and
3. A final evaluation report.

The main output of this undertaking is the final Evaluation Report containing clear and concise discussion of the findings and recommendations consistent with the objectives of the evaluation. The report shall be prepared based on the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards. Copies will be furnished upon awarding of the contract.

Methodology

The evaluation will employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The methodology should demonstrate impartiality and lack of bias by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using a mixed methodology (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.

The Consulting group will be requested to propose a detailed methodology. At the minimum, the evaluation shall adopt the following:

1. A desk review of existing literature on juvenile justice at international and national levels. As mentioned earlier, studies/assessments were conducted in the country with regard to DSWD shelters and centers, and very recently, on compliance by LGUs of their mandate under the juvenile justice law. There are certainly other similar and relevant researches that may have been undertaken in the past on the issue of CICL.

A large amount of material on juvenile justice has been produced by UNICEF. This includes independent assessments of juvenile justice reform in certain countries such as Montenegro, Moldova, Kosovo, Tajikistan, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, and a thematic evaluation of UNICEF’s contribution to juvenile justice system reform in Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, and Tajikistan (UNICEF Regional Office, 2007. These materials may be relevant especially in the areas of diversion, rehabilitation, and reintegration programs for CICL.

Secondary data will be assessed during the desk review to start addressing evaluation issues and identifying the information gaps. These data can be analyzed and included in the inception report.
2. **Field data collection through field visits, key informant interviews, and focus group discussion.** The evaluation team will conduct field visits to several areas in the country such as regional centers where the DSWD RRCYs are located, and also in 10 provinces and cities where a *Bahay Pag-asa* is operated and maintained. Similar visits will also be made in areas where NGO-run facilities are located. During such visits, interviews will be key informants from the DSWD field offices responsible for overseeing or supervising the operations of such facilities. Interviews will also be conducted with the administrators of DSWD facilities as well as the LGU- and NGO-run facilities.

Interviews and/or focus group discussions will be arranged for CICL described in 5.2 above. Community visits may be undertaken to validate the success of rehabilitation and diversion programs. Interviews with parents may also be undertaken. Ethical dimensions should be taken into account by the evaluation team with regard to consulting or interviewing children, ensuring their informed consent. Ethical guidance for evaluations can be accessed through the following link: [http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=980](http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=980). Additional child specific guidance will be shared with the evaluators.

During the field visits, interviews should also be undertaken with relevant governmental bodies and local officials, especially those responsible for diversion programs such as the local social welfare and development officers, barangay officials, police, prosecutors, and Family Court judges.

The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) standards and norms as well as those of DSWD should guide the evaluation.

The evaluation will proceed based on the following major stages:

1. **An Inception Report, including preparation of an evaluation framework,** shall be submitted and presented to and UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) which shall be created hereinafter. The report shall contain the overall plan and evaluation framework for the conduct of the evaluation. The inception report should also include a full methodology proposal covering data gathering processes, assessment instruments, and methods of analysis. The inception report is also expected to propose adjustments to the TOR if necessary, and other issues relevant to the successful completion of the assessment. The evaluation framework shall be based on the above evaluation scope, objectives, and list of questions.

2. **Secondary data collection and analysis.** As described above, the evaluation team shall undertake collection and analysis of secondary data through desk review, which should be considered and made part of the inception report.

3. **Primary data collection through survey, field visits, key informant interviews, and focus group discussion.** Likewise, the evaluation team shall undertake primary data collection and analysis through field visits, informant interviews, and focus group discussion as described above. Prior to conducting the field visits, the key evaluation instruments/tools shall be pre-tested.

4. **Presentation of preliminary findings and initial recommendations.** Workshops shall be convened by the Consulting group to present and validate preliminary findings and initial recommendations to DSWD and relevant government agencies and institutions such as the departments of justice, interior and local governments,
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social welfare and development; the national police agency; prosecutor’s office; barangay officials; local government officials; different leagues of local governments; residential care facilities’ administrators; NGOs and other relevant stakeholders.

**Deliverables**

The Consulting group shall deliver the following:

1. Inception Report;
2. A complete first draft evaluation report; and
3. A final evaluation report.

The main output of this undertaking is the final Evaluation Report containing clear and concise discussion of the findings and recommendations consistent with the objectives of the evaluation. The report shall be prepared based on the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards. Copies will be furnished upon awarding of the contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review of secondary documents and materials relevant to the conduct of the evaluation. The review will help provide the basis for drafting the scope, methodology and the design of the evaluation</td>
<td>Month 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct of consultation meetings. Consultation meetings shall be conducted with the concerned units/offices of the Department in preparation for the drafting of evaluation design and instruments, as well as in providing updates and in discussing and resolving implementation issues.</td>
<td>Month 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preparation of an inception report. The report will cover the plan for the conduct of the evaluation highlighting the evaluation design and framework, detailed methodology, data analyses of secondary data (desk review), evaluation instruments, and proposed charges to ensure the successful completion of the evaluation.</td>
<td>Month 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Collection. Conduct of data collection activities on the agreed timelines.</td>
<td>Months 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Presentation to the Evaluation Reference Group. Draft evaluation report to be presented to the evaluation manager and evaluation reference group.</td>
<td>Month 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Validation of draft evaluation results. A validation session shall be conducted to allow stakeholders including selected participating RRCYs and community-based services to confirm or clarify issues in the draft evaluation</td>
<td>Month 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results. This shall be a one-day activity to be held in the NCR.

7. **Presentation of evaluation report in a forum.**
   The Consulting Group shall prepare and present the final evaluation report in a forum to be attended by DSWD, UNICEF, and other relevant stakeholders.

8. **Finalization and submission of the Evaluation Report.** The report shall be finalized on the basis of the recommendations and additional inputs during the presentation forum with DSWD, UNICEF, and key stakeholders while preserving the independence of the evaluation.

**Duration of the consultancy**

This evaluation shall be undertaken within an estimated period of four (4) months. In the event of an extension in the implementation period, the Consulting Group shall not receive additional budget from UNICEF or DSWD.

**Management arrangements**

This undertaking will be managed and overseen by the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist of UNICEF, Philippines with the support of the Regional Evaluation Advisor, based in the UNICEF EAPRO Regional Office, especially on the agreed upon outputs/deliverables of the Consulting Group, upon which payments for their services shall be based.

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) shall be constituted by DSWD and UNICEF which shall serve as the advisory body for the evaluation. The ERG shall be composed of representatives from the following:

1. DSWD and its relevant units such as policy and planning, protective services, social protection and standards;
2. Juvenile Justice and Welfare Council;
3. Department of Justice;
4. Department of the Interior and Local Government;
5. National Prosecution Service;
6. Philippine National Police;
7. Selected Administrators of DSWD, LGU, and NGO facilities; and
8. Such other institutions as may be later on identified.

UNICEF will provide the financial support for this evaluation. The publication of the announcement for the need of a consulting group shall be the responsibility of UNICEF. The selection of the consulting group shall be jointly undertaken by DSWD and UNICEF.

All materials produced or acquired under the terms of this consultancy shall remain the property of
DSWD and UNICEF. DSWD and UNICEF furthermore retain the exclusive right to publish or disseminate the reports and studies arising from such materials even after the termination of this consultancy.

**Additional References**

The evaluation will use the following as references: Republic Act No. 9344, its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR), and the relevant Administrative Orders and other issuances by DSWD to implement the law.

For the purpose of this evaluation, the following definitions as stated in Rule 4 of the IRR of Republic Act No. 9344 are adopted:

- "Community-based programs" refer to the programs provided in a community setting developed for purposes of interventions and diversion, as well as rehabilitation of children in conflict with the law, for reintegration into his/her family and/or community.
- "Diversion" refers to an alternative, child-appropriate process of determining the responsibility and treatment of a child in conflict with the law on the basis of his/her social, cultural, economic, psychological, or educational background without resorting to formal court proceedings.
- "Intervention" refers to a series of activities designed to address issues that caused the child to commit an offense. It may take the form of an individualized treatment program which may include counseling, skills training, education, and other activities that will enhance his/her psychological, emotional, and psychosocial wellbeing.
- "Youth Detention Home or Youth Home" refers to a 24-hour child caring institution managed by accredited LGUs and licensed and/or accredited NGOs providing short-term residential care for children in conflict with the law who are awaiting court disposition of their cases or transfer to other agencies or jurisdictions.
- "Youth Rehabilitation Center or Youth Centers" refers to a 24-hour residential care facility that provides care for children in conflict with the law. Treatment and rehabilitation services under the guidance of trained staff where children in conflict with the law on suspended sentence or "residents" are cared for under a structured therapeutic environment with the end view of reintegrating them in their families and communities as socially functioning individuals.

The Juvenile Justice Welfare Council (JJWC) also produced four process flowcharts for handling CICL, which clearly indicates the different stages when diversion, intervention programs, and referrals to center-based and community-based options become available and appropriate for CICL. These process flowcharts are also based on the provisions of Republic Act No. 9344 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations.