

PROGRAM ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CHANGE

RA 8044: Why Youth Policy Needs Reform

Assessing the Youth in Nation-Building Act

Bonn Francis A. Mendoza 

Key Highlights

1. The Youth in Perspective

The Philippines is experiencing an unprecedented demographic moment: with a total population of 112.73 million as of July 2024 (Philippine Statistics Authority 2024), young Filipinos constitute a substantial portion of the national population. In the 2025 midterm elections, Generation Z voters alone accounted for nearly 20 million registered voters, while millennials and Gen Z combined comprised 63 percent of the voting-age population and 68 percent of all registered voters (GMA Integrated News 2025). This electoral weight translated into action: the 2025 polls recorded an 82.2 percent voter turnout—the highest for any midterm election in Philippine history—driven largely by youth participation (Abad 2025; Eva 2025; Nazario 2025).

2. The Core Problem

Despite the increase in youth engagement and faced with crises in climate vulnerability that disproportionately threaten young Filipinos' futures, a mental health epidemic exacerbated by pandemic disruptions, and persistent structural barriers to education and employment, Republic Act No. 8044, the Philippines' principal youth policy framework enacted nearly three decades ago, must be evaluated. Is our national law for the youth equipped to address the existential challenges facing contemporary Filipino youth?

3. Main Argument

This policy brief argues that while Republic Act No. 8044 (Youth in Nation-Building Act of 1995) provided a necessary institutional foundation for youth empowerment, it has evolved into a symbolic instrument unsuitable to address current challenges primarily experienced by the youth. The law's design relies on administrative discretion rather than statutory obligation, rendering its implementation vulnerable to institutional fragmentation, inconsistent funding, and policy drift.

4. Methodology

This brief employs qualitative policy analysis and comparative benchmarking to review the provisions of RA 8044 and assess gaps. Youth governance models from countries that are currently implementing strong co-decisional mechanisms were selected to demonstrate that such practice is feasible and viable whilst highlighting the Philippine model's deficiency.

What is RA No. 8044?

The Youth in Nation-Building Act (Republic Act No. 8044) was enacted in 1995, when youth comprised 30 percent of the Philippine population and nearly half the labor force (NYC 1998, quoted in Salazar 2003). This law established two core mechanisms: the

National Youth Commission (NYC) and the National Youth Development Plan (NYDP). These instruments provided the youth sector with a permanent institutional framework within the executive branch, mandating the NYC to prepare development plans, coordinate programs across agencies, and conduct research on youth conditions (Supreme Court E-Library 1995). The law also created the National Youth Parliament (NYP), a biennial consultative body of elected youth delegates whose recommendations are formally transmitted to government agencies, and integrated the Sangguniang Kabataan (SK) into the NYC's representational structure (Flores et al. 2022).

On paper, these provisions appear robust. RA No. 8044 included fiscal safeguards—limiting administrative expenses to 14 percent of the NYC budget—and mandated monitoring and evaluation through youth studies submitted to Congress and the President. As Flores et al. (2022) observe, RA No. 8044 institutionalized mechanisms to ensure that youth perspectives are embedded in governance structures. However, in practice, the law becomes inadequate given the current challenges the country is facing.

1. Centralized Authority Without Fiscal Autonomy

The NYC operates as a coordinating body without budgetary enforcement powers over line agencies. Unlike autonomous regulatory commissions, the NYC cannot compel compliance with the NYDP across sectoral ministries. This creates what scholars call institutional fragmentation—a scenario where youth programs exist in parallel silos rather than integrated policy streams (Sarmiento and Ignacio 2015; ESCAP 2000). This is particularly acute when

2. Consultative Mechanisms Without Decision-Making Power

The NYP and SK representation in the NYC is consultative rather than co-decisional. Recommendations from the NYP are “transmitted for consideration,” not binding deliberation. Velasco (2005) and United Nations Youth (2012) document that participation mechanisms like the SK often devolve into tokenism and bureaucracy rather than genuine leadership. The SK Reform Law's creation of Local Youth Development

Councils (LYDCs) attempted to address this gap, but Flores et al. (2022) found that implementation remains uneven due to limited technical skills, unclear roles, and inconsistent local government support.

3. Administrative Discretion over Statutory Obligation

The most recent Philippine Youth Development Plan (PYDP) 2023–2028, despite integrating Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets and evidence-based metrics, does not mandate such integration statutorily (NYC 2023). This renders NYC's sustainability efforts dependent on the discretion of successive administrations rather than legal compulsion. As the current draft notes, “alignment becomes a mere ceremony of compliance as it fails to make actual progress in encouraging youth participation in nation building.”

These issues explain why, as Puyat (2005) and Kilag (2024) document, Filipino youth remain constrained between opportunity and institutional barriers—valuing education and civil service yet facing persistent obstacles in accessing quality schooling, stable employment, and adequate health services.

Methodology

This brief uses qualitative policy analysis and comparative benchmarking. Scholarly texts and documents, such as national youth plans, progress reports, and peer-reviewed studies were reviewed to identify pertinent youth issues¹ and national government approaches to resolve. Studies were filtered using the following key themes accounting for Bangladesh, Nigeria, and selected Nordic countries were examined because they illustrate examples of youth participation embedded in governance structures. Specifically, Bangladesh and Nigeria demonstrate that stronger youth participation models are feasible in developing contexts, while Nordic countries show how youth councils can operate with clear authority and funding.

¹ Literature were filtered using the following key themes: mental health, climate governance, youth participation, national youth policy, youth framework, youth governance, youth inclusion.

The Policy-Implementation Gap

There are three critical domains where RA No. 8044's framework may be deemed insufficient: climate participation, mental health, and evidence-based accountability. This brief utilized comparative benchmarking. Essentially, scholarly evidence, reports, surveys, and studies regarding national-level youth policies and frameworks across the world were analyzed.

Climate Participation

RA 8044 contains no provision requiring youth involvement in climate governance, disaster risk management, or community resilience planning. This absence persists despite high levels of youth awareness and engagement on environmental issues (Caisip et al. 2022; British Council 2021; Kofi Annan Foundation 2024). Climate justice and environmental degradation directly affect youth futures, yet RA 8044 contains no provisions mandating youth involvement in climate governance, disaster risk management, or community resilience efforts. This omission is particularly glaring given the Philippines' vulnerability to climate-induced disasters and the global movement toward intergenerational climate accountability.

Mental Health

Youth mental health systems likewise remain insufficiently institutionalized into youth policy. Despite the existence of Republic Act No. 10036 (Mental Health Act), RA No. 8044 makes no reference to youth mental health infrastructure, especially in the context of rapid advancements in social media and its psychological effects (UNICEF Philippines 2023).

Evidence-Based Accountability

Finally, accountability mechanisms lack enforceable standards. There is a need for measurable indicators and regular performance reporting to strengthen accountability and transparency (Bastida 2024). While the PYDP 2023–2028 incorporates SDG-aligned targets, these remain voluntary benchmarks rather than legally enforceable standards. Overall, more than 10 years have passed, yet youth research in the Philippines still tends to describe problems rather than challenge the structures that produce them (Lanuza 2004), a critique equally applicable to RA 8044's monitoring provisions.

Collectively, these gaps demonstrate that RA 8044 has failed to evolve from a generalized nation-building framework into a proactive, crisis-responsive policy architecture. The law was designed for a post-EDSA developmental state emphasizing broad youth empowerment, not for targeted interventions addressing climate adaptation, mental health epidemics, or SDG accountability.

The Global Context

Benchmarking the Philippine youth policy model against other countries demonstrates that the Philippines is an outlier—centralized yet underfunded, consultative yet nonbinding, comprehensive yet unenforced. A 8044's deficiencies are not unique but exemplify a broader pattern of aspirational youth policies undermined by institutional design flaws. Youth in Bangladesh's parliament directly participate in public decision-making, not merely advisory consultation. Meanwhile, Nigeria's youth coalitions similarly embed young people in governance structures with binding deliberative authority. These demonstrate that directly placing youth in positions of power gives legislative influence and is therefore viable (Lelwic-Ojeda and Akintola 2024). The Philippine NYP, by contrast, operates as a ceremonial forum whose recommendations carry no enforcement weight.

For youth policies to be rendered effective, it requires three conditions: (1) sustained funding, (2) interagency coordination, and (3) localized program design (Divald 2015). The Philippines fails on all three counts with regard to its enforcement and monitoring provisions under Section 8. Policy failure stems not from non-recognition of problems but from poor policy architecture, insufficient implementation investments, and weak enforcement mechanisms (Divald 2015; and the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, n.d.).

Moreover, the Nordic model emphasizes integration into youth processes, where the youth are co-creators of policy rather than beneficiaries (Lelwic-Ojeda and Akintola 2024). Youth councils in Sweden and Finland have statutory powers to veto or amend legislation affecting young people, backed by dedicated budget lines. By contrast, RA No. 8044 adopts a "protectionist approach" wherein the youth is treated as a vulnerable sector requiring state intervention but without the sustained funding or policy coherence characteristic of European models (Wallace and Bendit 2009). RA No. 8044 falls short of even this

protectionist standard due to chronic underfunding and uneven implementation. In this spirit, what the Philippine model lacks is the treatment of the youth as both a problem and solution requiring centralized state intervention (Wallace and Bendit 2009).

Recommendations

Legislative reform can transform RA 8044 from a symbolic commitment to an effective policy instrument.

First, mental health should be elevated from discretionary programming to statutory obligation by amending Section 14 to require the NYC to formulate, implement, and monitor a National Youth Mental Health Strategy in coordination with the Department of Health, Department of Education, and Commission on Higher Education. This strategy should encompass youth-specific service standards, school-based programs, crisis intervention systems, and workforce development, with annual progress reports to Congress and the President. Such specificity creates enforceable benchmarks while establishing clear interagency accountability.

Second, the climate participation gap can be addressed by amending Section 17 to mandate youth representation in Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Councils. Requiring at least two youth representatives nominated by Local Youth Development Councils with full voting rights in deliberations, budget allocation, and policy formulation embeds young people in local climate governance with co-decisional authority rather than mere consultation.

Third, with regard to a call for measurable indicators, Section 8 should be amended to mandate SDG-aligned monitoring and reporting. The National Youth Development Plan should explicitly align with relevant SDG targets, and the NYC should publish biennial youth development indicators using data disaggregated by age, sex, region, and socioeconomic status through publicly accessible digital platforms. This transforms the voluntary SDG integration in PYDP 2023–2028 into a statutory requirement with public accountability mechanisms.

RA No. 8044 represents the Philippines' institutional commitment to youth empowerment, yet nearly three decades after enactment, the law has become structurally obsolete. Its reliance on administrative discretion rather than statutory obligation renders

it vulnerable to policy drift, fiscal neglect, and institutional fragmentation, while global youth policies have evolved toward climate resilience, mental health integration, and evidence-based accountability.

The proposed amendments are not radical redesigns but targeted interventions that operationalize RA No. 8044's stated intent. Mandating a National Youth Mental Health Strategy, embedding youth in local disaster governance, and requiring SDG-aligned monitoring transforms consultative mechanisms into co-decisional partnerships and shifts the NYC from a coordinating body dependent on executive goodwill to an enforcement agency backed by statutory mandates.

The 2025 electoral surge in youth participation signals a generational shift in political mobilization, and whether RA No. 8044 can channel this energy into sustainable development outcomes depends on legislative willingness to confront the law's structural defects. Philippine youth research must move beyond describing problems to challenging the structures that produce them (Lanuza 2004). The choice is between continuing to treat youth as subjects of ceremonial empowerment or recognizing them as co-creators of national development entitled to legal protections, institutional resources, and enforceable rights.

References

- Abad, Michelle. "Voter Turnout Hits 82.2% in 2025, a Record High for Midterm Polls." *Rappler*, 15 May 2025. <https://www.rappler.com/philippines/elections/voter-turnout-comelec-report-may-2025/>.
- Bastida, Elena L. 2024. "Creating an SDG-Oriented Youth Engagement Plan." *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review* 24 (1): 1–20. <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1541&context=apssr>.
- British Council Philippines. 2021. *Youth Voice on Climate Action: The Philippines*. Manila: British Council. https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/youth_voices_on_climate_action_philippines.pdf.
- Caisip, Andrian A., and Ken Paul M. Espinosa. 2022. "Filipino Youth's Awareness of Climate Change Impacts: Basis for Program Development in Vulnerable Urban Communities." *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 59 (2): 385–95. <https://psychologyandeducation.net/pae/index.php/pae/article/view/7327/5929>.

- Divald, Susan. 2015. *Comparative Analysis of Policies for Youth Employment in Asia and the Pacific*. Geneva: International Labour Organization. <https://www.ilo.org/publications/comparative-analysis-policies-youth-employment-asia-and-pacific>.
- Eva, Edg Adrian. “‘Very High’ Turnout Seen in Polls.” *BusinessWorld*, May 14, 2025. <https://www.bworldonline.com/the-nation/2025/05/14/672555/very-high-turnout-seen-in-polls/>.
- Flores, Leon III, Kier Jesse D. Ballar, Jurel Yap, and Imelda Deinla. 2022. “Youth Political Participation and Governance in the Philippines Five Years Since the Ratification of the Sangguniang Kabataan (SK) Reform Law.” *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4024887>.
- GMA Integrated News. 2025. “Millennials, Gen Z Make Up 63% of Voting Population.” *GMA News Online*, February 9, 2025. <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/935726/millennials-gen-z-make-up-63-of-eleksyon-2025-voters/story/>.
- Kilag, Osias Kit. 2024. “Filipino Youth for a Stronger Future of the New Philippines.” *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence* 1 (6): 109–17. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/ijrise/article/view/460>.
- Kofi Annan Foundation. 2024. *Climate, Conflict, Collaboration in the Philippines: Youth & Community Perspectives*. Geneva: Kofi Annan Foundation. <https://www.kofiannanfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/CS-YOUTH-CLIMATE-PEACE-Philippines-2.pdf>.
- Lanuza, Gerry. 2004. “The Theoretical State of Philippine Youth Studies: Current Trends and Future Directions.” *Young* 12 (4): 357–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1103308804046719>.
- Lelwic-Ojeda, Alicja, and Lukmon Akintola. 2024. *A Comparative Analysis on National Youth Policies*. Youth Democracy Cohort. <https://youthdemocracycohort.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/A-comparative-analysis-on-National-Youth-Policies-Full-Layout.pdf>.
- National Youth Commission (NYC). 2023. *Philippine Youth Development Plan 2023–2028*. Quezon City: National Youth Commission. <https://nyc.gov.ph/downloadables>.
- Nazario, Dhel. “Youth Vote Credited for Historic Turnout in 2025 Midterm Polls.” *Manila Bulletin*, 15 May 2025. <https://mb.com.ph/2025/05/15/youth-vote-credited-for-historic-turnout-in-2025-midterm-polls>.
- Philippine Statistics Authority. 2024. “2024 Census of Population (POPCEN) Population Counts Declared Official by the President.” 17 July 2024. Accessed 30 December 2025. <https://psa.gov.ph/content/2024-census-population-popcen-population-counts-declared-official-president>.
- Puyat, Joseph H. 2005. “The Filipino Youth Today: Their Strengths and the Challenges They Face.” Paper presented at the First National Conference on Youth Research, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281262668_The_Filipino_Youth_Today_Their_Strengths_and_the_Challenges_They_Face.
- Youth in Nation-Building Act. 1995. Republic Act No. 8044. 7 June 1995. Supreme Court E-Library. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/3803>.
- Salazar, Charles E. 2003. *Youth in the Philippines: A Review of the Youth Situation and National Policies and Programmes*. Manila: National Youth Commission and UNESCO. <https://charlesesalazar.pbworks.com/f/youth%2Bin%2Bthe%2Bphilippines.pdf>.
- Sarmiento, Darryl Louise, and Louie Benedict R. Ignacio. 2015. “Youth in Nation-Building Act: Policy Development as Influenced by the Young through the Kabataan Party-List.” *Antorcha* 2 (1–2): 1–11. <https://research-manila.lettran.edu.ph/article/24>.
- UNICEF Philippines. 2023. *Strengthening Mental Health Systems and Services for Children and Adolescents—Philippines Country Report*. Manila: UNICEF Philippines. [https://www.unicef.org/philippines/media/6071/file/Strengthening%20Mental%20Health%20Systems%20and%20Services%20for%20Children%20and%20Adolescents%20\(Philippines%20Country%20Report\).pdf](https://www.unicef.org/philippines/media/6071/file/Strengthening%20Mental%20Health%20Systems%20and%20Services%20for%20Children%20and%20Adolescents%20(Philippines%20Country%20Report).pdf).
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. n.d. *Review of the World Programme of Action for Youth Implementation in the Philippines: Country Report*. Quezon City: National Youth Commission. <https://>

www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/documents/wpaysubmissions/philippines.pdf.

Velasco, Djinora. 2005. "The Sangguniang Kabataan: Good Intentions, Weak Structures." In *Checkpoints and Chokepoints: Philippine Decentralization and Democracy after Estrada*, edited by Joel Rocamora, 97–115. Quezon City: Institute for Popular Democracy. https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/philippinen/04526/countrypapers_philippines.pdf.

Wallace, Claire, and Rene Bendit. 2009. "Youth Policies in Europe: Towards a Classification of Different Tendencies in Youth Policies in the European Union." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 10 (3): 441–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15705850903105868>.

THE UP CIDS POLICY BRIEF SERIES

The UP CIDS Policy Brief Series features short reports, analyses, and commentaries on issues of national significance and aims to provide research-based inputs for public policy.

Policy briefs contain findings on issues that are aligned with the core agenda of the research programs under the University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UP CIDS).

The views and opinions expressed in this policy brief are those of the author/s and neither reflect nor represent those of the University of the Philippines or the UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies. UP CIDS policy briefs cannot be reprinted without permission from the author/s and the Center.

Center For Integrative And Development Studies

Established in 1985 by University of the Philippines (UP) President Edgardo J. Angara, the UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UP CIDS) is the policy research unit of the University that connects disciplines and scholars across the several units of the UP System. It is mandated to encourage collaborative and rigorous research addressing issues of national significance by supporting scholars and securing funding, enabling them to produce outputs and recommendations for public policy.

The UP CIDS currently has twelve research programs that are clustered under the areas of education and capacity building, development, and social, political, and cultural studies. It publishes policy briefs, monographs, webinar/conference/forum proceedings, and the Philippine Journal for Public Policy, all of which can be downloaded free from the UP CIDS website.

The Program

The Program on Social and Political Change (PSPC) provides a platform for understanding the varied social and political challenges facing modern Philippine society and polity from a multidisciplinary perspective. In relation to this, the Program also designs empirical studies using a variety of methods and approaches which form the basis for policy inputs and discussions at the local, national, and international levels.

Editorial Board

Rosalie Arcala Hall
Editor-in-Chief

Honeylet L. Alerta
Deputy Editor-in-Chief

Program Editors

Education and Capacity Building Cluster

Dina S. Ocampo
Lorina Y. Calingasan
Education Research Program

Rosalie Arcala Hall
Program on Higher Education Research and Policy Reform

Romylyn Metila
Marlene Ferido
Assessment, Curriculum, and Technology Research Program

Ebinezer R. Florano
Program on Data Science for Public Policy

Social, Political, and Cultural Studies Cluster

Rogelio Alicor L. Pano
Program on Social and Political Change

Darwin J. Absari
Islamic Studies Program

Rosalie Arcala Hall
Strategic Studies Program

Editorial Staff

Jheimeel P. Valencia
Bryan Patrick Garcia
Copyeditor

Development Cluster

Annette O. Balaoing-Pelkmans
Program on Escaping the Middle-Income Trap: Chains for Change

Antoinette R. Raquiza
Julius Lustro
Political Economy Program

Eduardo C. Tadem
Maria Dulce Natividad
Program on Alternative Development

Iris Thiele Isip-Tan
Program on Health Systems Development

New Programs

Maria Angeles O. Catelo
Food Security Program

Weena S. Gera
Urban Studies Program

Benjamin M. Vallejo, Jr.
Conservation and Biodiversity

Rosalie Arcala Hall
Local and Regional Studies Network

Alexa Samantha R. Hernandez
Editorial Assistant

Mikaela Anna Cheska D. Orlino
Layout Artist

Get your policy papers published. Download open-access articles.

The Philippine Journal of Public Policy: Interdisciplinary Development Perspectives (PJPP), the annual peer-reviewed journal of the UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UP CIDS), welcomes submissions in the form of full-length policy-oriented manuscripts, book reviews, essays, and commentaries. The PJPP provides a multidisciplinary forum for examining contemporary social, cultural, economic, and political issues in the Philippines and elsewhere. Submissions are welcome year-round.

For more information, visit cids.up.edu.ph. All issues/articles of the PJPP can be downloaded for free.

Get news and the latest publications.

Join our mailing list to get our publications delivered straight to your inbox! Also, you'll receive news of upcoming webinars and other updates.

bit.ly/signup_cids

We need your feedback.

Have our publications been useful? Tell us what you think.

bit.ly/dearcids



UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
CENTER FOR INTEGRATIVE AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Lower Ground Floor, Ang Bahay ng Alumni, Magsaysay Avenue
University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City 1101



cids.up.edu.ph

Telephone (02) 8981-8500 loc. 4266 to 4268
(02) 8426-0955

Email cids@up.edu.ph
cidspublications@up.edu.ph

Website cids.up.edu.ph