



**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR INTERMEDIATE EVALUATION  
AECID PROJECT 2017/PRYC/000506:**

**Increase the resilience of vulnerable populations and their livelihoods  
against climate change**

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Evaluation Objectives and Background.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Actors involved.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Scope of the Evaluation.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. Questions and criteria for the evaluation.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6. Evaluation methodology and work plan.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7. Documents and sources of information.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>8. Structure and presentation of the evaluation report.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>9. Evaluation team.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>10. Premises for evaluation and dissemination.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>11. Deadlines for carrying out the evaluation.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>12. Submission of the technical and financial bid and evaluation criteria.....</b>	<b>11</b>

## **1. Introduction**

For more than a decade, Cáritas Philippines and Cáritas Spain have maintained an intense relationship of collaboration with a common goal: to be the expression of the Church's love for the poorest and most excluded, promoting their integral development and working to achieve social justice.

At this time, our relationship has been based on relations of equality, respect, co-responsibility and reciprocity.

In Caritas Spain, in the last years, we have moved forward in the accompaniment processes of our local partners and we have taken important steps in the prioritization of the evaluation and knowledge management in institutional processes and projects. The challenge is transforming this process in institutional policy, integrating the evaluations learnings in broader planning cycles. In this sense, evaluating the results and impacts of our actions is a key element.

We think that this process is an institutional opportunity to strengthen links between the different participating organizations and strengthen the projects implementation, with the active involvement of all actors.

In the initiatives supported by Caritas Spain, we aim at putting in place measures to contribute to directly eradicating the causes of poverty and its consequences, as well as introducing the component of sustainability. In order to reach these goals, beneficiaries' participation is essential since they are the first responsible for their own development.

Also, Caritas Spain considers that monitoring and assessment of all our projects and programmes is a key in order to optimise the results of our actions and encourage learning.

In this way, the process will have the result of providing information about the impact (individual and collective) in the communities where the projects are implemented.

## **2. Evaluation Object and background:**

The project subject to evaluation is called: "Increase the resilience of vulnerable populations and their livelihoods against climate change."

This two-year project is envisioned to strengthen resilience to disaster risks and poverty for 3.573 households reaching 16.688 people, in 4 barangays in the provinces of Agusan del Sur, Misamis Oriental and Bukidnon of Mindanao Region. The organizations responsible to implement the project will be: NASSA/Caritas Philippines, the Archdiocese of Cagayan de Oro (Birhen sa Kota Development Foundation, Inc.), and the Diocese of Butuan (Social Action Center-Justice and Peace). The project will address three major components, 1) community-managed disaster risk reduction (CMDRR) and emergency response; 2) climate resilient socio-economic development; and 3) improvement in local government processes.

The intervention focuses on the strengthening of the rights holders, responsibility holders and duty bearer, these are local government units, State agencies, organizations of civil society,

families and other marginalized groups in the barangays, as a strategy to ensure the sustainability of the expected results. Specifically, it will support farmers, fishermen, women, children and indigenous peoples who are in extreme poverty, for a better adaptation to changing environmental conditions. Therefore, the project is based on climate resilient livelihoods, CMDRR and emergency preparedness. It is expected also to strengthen local organizations and local governments to collaborate in the design of a local development agenda and participatory governance processes.

Specifically, the project aims to achieve the following goals: improve the management capacity of DRR, both at local government units, and households. Strengthen the economic activities of the poorest households. Empower Barangay councils to enact local ordinances through proactive participation, that responds to the social and economic development needs and disaster risk reduction. All this will be implemented in two 2 phases:

Phase 1 (year 1): start with the development of capacities for the preparation of emergency, community management of reducing the disaster risk (CMDRR) and community organization. Drawn up a baseline with profiles of the communities, including the identification of appropriate livelihood activities and food security strategies. Implement the initial phase of its resources, including the introduction of the self-help group (SHeG) approach and the practice of sustainable agriculture.

Stage 2 (year 2): second phase of implementation for livelihood activities, registry of cooperatives and community organizations, accreditation of community leaders in different organs of Government at the barangay level, publication of different proceedings in relation to the Agriculture and disaster management, and publication of a local development agenda

### 3. Actors involved

The promoters of the external final evaluation are AECID and Cáritas Española.

The evaluation management unit is composed of Cáritas Española, NASSA (local partner) and AECID/OTC. This management unit will be responsible for preparing and validating the TOR, selecting the evaluation team, monitoring the quality of the evaluation process, validating the final evaluation report, disseminating the results and launching the improvement plan in the light of the recommendations made in the external evaluation.

The evaluation steering committee is composed of the members of the Management unit and NASSA, which is the in-country steering committee for the Program. This committee will be responsible for facilitating the evaluation process and access to key informants and disseminating the results of the evaluation to the actors involved.

Details of the key informants for the external evaluation are shown in the following table:

Actors	Key informants (relevant sample of each Barangay)
<b>Rights holders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barangay farmers, women and vulnerable collectives</li> <li>Members of the cooperatives (4 cooperatives)</li> </ul>
<b>Obligation holders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LGU government offices and 4 Barangay government offices.</li> <li>Butuan City Government</li> </ul>

Actors	Key informants (relevant sample of each Barangay)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agusan del Norte Provincial Government</li> <li>• Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction Council (PDRRMC)</li> <li>• Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)</li> <li>• Department of Science and Technology (DOST)</li> <li>• Department of Agriculture (DA)</li> <li>• Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)</li> </ul>
<b>Responsibilities holders</b>	<b>Local partner:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social Action Center of Butuan, Justice and Peace (SAC-JP)</li> <li>• Birhen sa Kota Development Foundation, Inc. (BKDFI)</li> <li>• NASSA-Cáritas Philippines.</li> <li>• Caritas Spain</li> <li>• OTC</li> </ul>

#### 4. Scope of the Evaluation:

The main objective is to capitalize on what has worked so far, highlighting the actions and impacts most successful, drawing lessons learned and developing concrete recommendations for improvement. Therefore, the assessment is part of a learning process that will facilitate and legitimize the future decision-making, guiding the planning.

The period to be assessed is the entire projects' implementation period, up to now.

In general, the **objectives** of this assessment are:

- Analyse the positive and negative impact generated by the interventions, including identification of their strengths and weaknesses, making recommendations to improve our actions, in the frame of Spanish cooperation policy.
- To assess the relevance and adequacy of the actions proposed in relation with the beneficiaries' needs in their specific context.
- To offer recommendations for improving the action in the future.

To do this, we consider that analysis of the following should be stressed:

- Processes of identification and design of the intervention considering its relevance.
- Methodologies used to address the actions, analyzing the partners' action model.
- Assess the degree of empowerment of the communities and the impact on them.
- Analyze systems for monitoring and accompaniment from the National Office to the regional offices, and Caritas Spain fraternal cooperation model.
- Analyze levels of participation and collaboration by all actors (National Office, DSAC, LGU, barangay government, local organizations, Cáritas Española, etc.) including rights-holders.
- Specifically analyze the impact of the projects' main components (achieving results and improvements for future projects).

The aspects of gender and environmental sustainability must be also evaluated.

### **5. Questions and criteria for the evaluation**

With regards to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation should be carried out in accordance with internationally recognised technical standards. In particular, the Evaluation Criteria for Spanish Aid will be taken into account, prioritised as follows:

Prioritised evaluation criteria	Assessment questions
<b>Relevance</b>	<p>Do the issues identified match the problems and priorities of the actors involved?</p> <p>Have the priorities of the rights-holding group — including local partners — changed since the overall intervention was defined, and has the intervention been adapted to such changes?</p> <p>What mechanisms for the monitoring and continuous assessment of rights-holders' priorities have been put in place, and how can they be improved?</p> <p>Has the implemented intervention model and methodological approach been adequate for achieving the objectives and results of the agreement? Emphasis on strategies to incorporate the gender approach.</p> <p>Is the project fostering the inclusion of the most vulnerable families in the socio-economic development process?</p> <p>Did the project addressed the vulnerability of their livelihoods?</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>Are the knowledge and skills obtained through the project meant to last?          To what extent are institutional capacities being strengthened?          Has empowerment of the different actors involved in the projects been achieved? Propose improvements to achieve this empowerment.</p> <p>Do the CSOs play an important role in sustaining the activities?</p> <p>Are there laws (ordinances) that supports the sustainability of the activities?</p> <p>Without the project intervention, are the cooperatives still operating and have an active role as local development actors?          Do the farmers continue to use agro ecological techniques?</p> <p>Has the development program had an impact in farmers' climate change adaptation?</p> <p>Does the Local Government Development Agenda really have an impact over daily decision-making?</p> <p>Are the ordinances (DRR, agriculture) being implemented?</p>

Prioritised evaluation criteria	Assessment questions
<b>Ownership</b>	<p>What is the degree of ownership of the project's rights-holders, obligation-holders and local teams? Analyse the existence of initiatives to facilitate appropriation by the various actors.</p> <p>Do the various actors involved in the project consider its impact to be significant?</p>
<b>Participation</b>	<p>What has been the level of participation by the different actors — including obligation-holders — in the design and implementation of the actions?</p> <p>Have the participation mechanisms established been effective? And the mechanism for the participation of women?</p> <p>Are there obstacles for the participation of the most vulnerable groups? Have activities and strategies been considered to enhance coordination between actors?</p> <p>Have strategies been considered to enhance relations between local organisations and local authorities? If they have been so, explain their impact for the project.</p> <p>Did the local CSOs achieve federation level?</p> <p>What is the level of beneficiaries' and local government units' awareness on participatory governance?</p>
<b>Impact</b>	<p>Has implementation in the various areas been successful and had a positive impact? Evaluate the positive and negative impact on the target groups</p> <p>What recommendations would be necessary introduce to achieve more impact?</p> <p>Has there been gender impact (negative and positive). Explain the response and establish recommendations to achieve a better positive gender impact.</p> <p>Aside from the direct TTD, did the project contribute to capacitate the members of the barangay local government units, organizational leaders and local parishes?</p> <p>Is there a significant improvement in the level of resilience of the communities linked to the new contingency plans, risk assessment and CMDRR?</p> <p>Are the local government units' allocation of DRR funds done in the right process?</p> <p>Has the development program had a direct impact on household economy for the participants?</p> <p>Had the socio-enterprises built benefited other members of the community directly or indirectly?</p>

Prioritised evaluation criteria	Assessment questions
	<p>Has the project contributed to rise the local government capacities to promote local development with the resources available?</p> <p>Has the project increased local government units' awareness in involving the community in LGU management through the process of participatory governance?</p>
<b>Gender impact</b>	<p>Have been equal the effects of the projects for men and women?</p> <p>Regarding the access to the capitalization and financial services through a credit or technical services: How is the impact of the system? Does it constitute the most appropriate instrument, in terms of efficacy and efficiency, to improve women's socio-economic status?</p> <p>Did the members heavy reliance on loan institutions decreases?</p> <p>Regarding the Income Generating Activities: Are they being successful? At household level, how do women participate in the decision-making to use the profits?</p> <p>Do the Barangay Local Government Units support these IGAs through lenient requirements?</p> <p>Are the women included in the organizational structures?</p>
<b>Methodological aspects</b>	<p>Have the monitoring mechanisms defined been useful?</p> <p>Has the predefined indicators system been useful? Has it enabled to measure the impact generated? Is it sufficient information available to measure this impact including the gender impact?</p> <p>Have the mechanisms for coordination and communication at the various levels been useful? Indicate recommendations to improve them.</p> <p>Has the Caritas Spain accompaniment model (fraternal cooperation) been adequate?</p>
<b>Community added value</b>	<p>Is the project fostering community social cohesion? Did it help achieve development and self-reliance?</p>

The evaluation will also value the progress made in achieving the objectives and results of the Program, working according to the schedule and within the budget.

Transversal factors such as the gender approach, the environment and the transfer of know-how and technology will also be taken into account.

## 6. Evaluation methodology and work plan

Methodological rigour in the evaluation design will be valued, in order to enable:

- The application of techniques addressing the validity and reliability of social research to be assured.
- A methodological approach to be taken that can validate all four levels of analysis for valuation: findings, interpretative analysis based on that data, facts and information found, final judgments (conclusions) and recommendations.
- A standard interpretation to be made, taking in all the dimensions of the intervention (design, structure, resources, processes and results) and interpretation of causes and influential factors.

To evaluate the criteria proposed in this evaluation, we recommend the use of quantitative and qualitative techniques such as open and semi-structured interviews, discussion groups, visits and direct observation. Interviews or discussion groups with the final beneficiaries in country, including the gender dimension, will be positively valued.

Particular value will be placed on the triangulation of the data collection and analysis and solid argumentation of the conclusions drawn and recommendations made.

The evaluation management unit expects to receive feedback from the consulting team at several times: for validating the final work plan and final data-collection methodology before entering the fieldwork phase; for briefing on the preliminary results before completing the fieldwork phase; for providing comments to the evaluation draft report and recommendations before its finalization.

The following working schedule is intended to serve as a guide:

Phase	Actions	Date
Office work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review Project documentations</li> <li>2. Design of data collection tools and evaluation matrix</li> </ol>	March 2020
Field work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Interviews with key informants, data collection</li> <li>2. Briefing the Evaluation committee with first conclusions</li> </ol>	March 2020 (3 weeks)
Reporting work	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drafting the evaluation report</li> <li>2. Review and validation products by the evaluation committee.</li> </ol>	April 2020
Sharing reporting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meetings with different actors in Manila</li> <li>2. Sending reports to local partners.</li> </ol>	May 2020

**Note:** This is a proposed schedule, intended to serve as a guide to the duration of the process. However, the evaluation team is not bound by it and should fix their own final schedule.

## 7. Documents and source of information

We consider essential for the evaluation team to review the documentation listed below, plus any others that the team may require as the process progresses:

Document	Location
Formulation of the Project (narrative + budget) Identification diagnoses and base line Internal Program reports (quarterly) Project annexes	Provided by Caritas Española
AECID rules on Projects	AECID website
Spanish Aid's Philippines Country Association Framework	Website and provided by Caritas Española

## 8. Structure and presentation of the evaluation report

Requirements for the presentation of the evaluation report:

- Maximum 50 pages for the final report, plus appendices.
- Include an executive summary, max. 5 pages.
- The report should be delivered in both Spanish and English. The evaluator is responsible for obtaining the relevant translations, the costs of which may be included in the evaluation budget.
- Three hard (paper) copies and one electronic copy to be delivered in each language.
- A PowerPoint presentation to be prepared, setting out the main evaluation's conclusions and recommendations, max. 20 slides.

The following structure for the final report is provided to serve as a guide:

1. Executive summary. (Max. 5 pages.)
2. Introduction: presenting the purpose of the evaluation exercise, the evaluation questions addressed and the main results obtained. (Max. 2 pages.)
3. Description of the intervention assessed: setting out the objectives and logical structure of the planning of the Program. A brief description of the Project should be included, referring to any relevant background. Organisation and management procedures should be described, identifying the main actors involved and indicating the economic, social, political and institutional context in which the intervention is taking place. (Max. 3 pages.)
4. Methodology used for the evaluation, explaining the methodology and techniques used during the evaluation, as well as any conditioning factors for and limits to the study carried out. (Max. 5 pages.)
5. Analysis of information compiled, beginning with the analysis of the documentation compiled, the section should address the questions and evaluation criteria established in advance, in accordance with the integrated evaluation approach proposed by the awarding entity. Any evidence found related to the evaluation questions set out should be presented, together with interpretations of that evidence.
6. Conclusions: setting out the main conclusions drawn in respect of the evaluation criteria established and including the strong and weak points of project.

7. Lessons learned: obtained from the overall conclusions of the evaluation, indicating any best practices that might be extrapolated
8. Recommendations: beginning with the conclusions set out in the report, recommendations should be made with a view to improving any future actions. It is important for these recommendations to be specific and feasible in the remaining Program-implementation time, indicating the actor(s) to whom these recommendations are specifically being made.
9. Appendices: including the TOR, the completed CAD file, the methodology adopted, the information-compiling tools used, the work plan, the make-up and description of the mission, views expressed and comments made by the various actors on the draft report, and any other information considered relevant.

### 9. Evaluation team

The evaluation team must assure the following objectives:

- Quality of the evaluation in terms of methodology.
- Quality of technical conclusions and, by extension, technical knowledge of the intervention sector.
- Credibility and legitimacy of the conclusions drawn and recommendations made.
- Independence of the analysis and conclusions with regard to the government, the donor, Caritas Española and the beneficiaries.
- Knowledge of the local context, customs, traditions, legal framework, etc.

Taking into account the objectives, a team of at least two people must be proposed, to allow profiles to be combined and the analysis of the information to be triangulated. It is proposed that the viewpoint and analysis of a consultant with considerable experience of evaluations and natural resources management in other contexts should be combined with the knowledge of the context and problems specific to Philippines provided by one or two partners.

Details of the profile sought for the evaluation team are as follows:

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS	PROFILE
<b>Consultant or evaluation team</b>	Broad experience of project evaluations.  Extensive knowledge of the intervention sector of the project: food security, DRR, marketing of products and farming cooperatives, and building institutional capacities.  Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methods and techniques.  English-language skills. Knowledge of Spanish will also be valued.  Experience working with non-profit entities and knowledge of Spanish aid policy will also be valued.
<b>Local partners</b>	Broad experience of project evaluations.  Extensive knowledge of the intervention sector of the project, particularly food security, DRR, the functioning, management and legislation of Agricultural Cooperatives, and the gender approach.

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS	PROFILE
	Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methods and techniques.  Experience working with non-profit entities and knowledge of development policy will also be valued

During the planning phase the evaluation team should submit its final work plan, as agreed with the evaluation management unit, together with a model for the evaluation report for the project, the structure and content of which must also be approved by the management unit.

Any changes in the composition of the team proposed must be communicated in advance to the management unit.

If no agreement can be reached with the local partners on the conclusions of the evaluation, both points of view should be included in the report, indicating the points of divergence of opinion and setting out the respective arguments.

### **10. Premises for evaluation and dissemination**

The following basic premises are required for ethical, professional behaviour by the work team:

**Anonymity and confidentiality:** The evaluation must uphold people’s right to provide information anonymously and in confidence.

**Responsibility:** Any disagreement or difference of opinion that may arise among the members of the group or between them and those in charge of the intervention regarding the conclusions or recommendations should be mentioned in the report. Any claims made must be sustained by the team and any disagreement reported.

**Integrity:** The evaluation team will be expected to cover any issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if doing so will help a fuller analysis of the intervention to be arrived at.

**Independence:** The team must assure its independence from the intervention under evaluation, having no links with its management or any of its component parts.

**Data protection:** The Consulting firm undertakes to maintain the strictest professional secrecy and confidentiality in respect of any personal data to which it has access in consequence of the evaluation carried out and to duly comply with the duty of custody of such data required under the Personal Data Protection. This requirement shall apply to the evaluation firm throughout the term of the services contract and subsequent to its expiry for any related cause. The evaluation firm further expressly undertakes to take the necessary technical and organisational steps to protect the security of any personal data to which it has access and to prevent any alteration, loss, unauthorised processing of or access to such data, taking into account the current technology available, the nature of the data stored and the risks to which it is exposed, whether from human action or from the physical or natural environment, complying in this respect with the relevant provisions of the Personal Data Protection Act 15/1999 at all times and the regulation of personal data protection (RGPD), 2016.

**Verification of information:** The evaluation team is responsible for assuring the accuracy of the information compiled for the preparation of its reports and shall be responsible in the last instance for the information presented in the evaluation report.

**Incidents:** Any problems arising during the field work or at any other stage of the evaluation must be communicated immediately to the NGDO, which at its own discretion will forward the relevant information to the funding agency. Otherwise the existence of any such problems may not be used to justify any failure to obtain the results established by the NGDO under these TOR.

**Copyright and dissemination.** It should be clear that all copyright corresponds to the entity contracting the evaluation. The dissemination of the information compiled and the final report remains the prerogative of the NGDO.

**Penalty arrangements.** In the event of any delay in the delivery of reports or if the quality of the reports delivered is manifestly lower than what was agreed with the NGDO, the penalties and arbitration measures established by the contracting entity under the official terms and conditions of the contract entered into with the evaluation firm shall apply.

## **11. Deadlines**

The estimated time required for the evaluation is 9 weeks (see schedule in point 6).

The evaluation deadlines will be formally fixed in the contract entered into with the evaluation team, together with the delivery dates for the products for each of the phases of the evaluation.

## **12. Submission of the technical and financial bid and evaluation criteria**

In order to participate in the tender process, the tenderer must submit its proposal in digital format, according to the data indicated in these ToR, within thirty (30) calendar days ((up to and including 15th January). The technical proposal should include a work schedule setting out the milestones proposed by the firm for the various evaluation tasks.

The technical proposal should have the following characteristics:

1. Cover indicating:
  - Company name, person, evaluation team, etc.
  - Title of the evaluation and the project title (whether intermediate, final, etc.)
  - Contact details for the firm, independent evaluator, evaluation team, etc.)
2. Technical bid, to include:
  - The firm's detailed CV (as appropriate)
  - Detailed CVs of the members of the team who will carry out the evaluation.
3. Remit and working methodology, to include:
  - Objectives of the evaluation.
  - Remit of the evaluation.
  - Preliminary proposal for participatory methodologies, focusing on rights, gender issues, etc.
  - Preliminary proposal for information sources (documentary, key informants, beneficiaries, other stakeholders, etc.)

4. Work schedule, to include:
  - Evaluation tasks.
  - Time planning for the review and reporting deadlines (detailed schedule).
5. Proposal for the report, giving details of its main features.
6. Budget, to include:
  - All expenses incurred in the carrying-out of the evaluation and proposed payment terms.
  - Financial bid, broken down into as much detail as possible.
  - Include VAT in the budget.

Bidders will be informed of their exclusion or success within 15 calendar days of the opening of the proposals received.

The corresponding contract will be signed within 15 days following receipt of the final-award notice.

The successful bidder undertakes to execute the contract in its own right, as any third-party assignment or subcontracting is prohibited, unless specifically authorised by CÁRITAS ESPAÑOLA.

Furthermore, the contractor shall be liable for any consequences derived from any inaccuracies in statements made in respect of compliance with the obligations under these TOR and the subsequent contract entered into.

The bids submitted will be scored with a possible total of 100 points, broken down as follows:

1. **Technical quality of the proposal** and its suitability for the purposes fixed: **40 points**.  
The quality of the bid submitted will be scored on the following basis:
  - The degree to which the evaluation team assures the issue of a systematic judgment.
  - Appropriateness of the techniques and methodologies proposed for the budget and deadlines required.
  - Whether a sufficient response to the evaluation questions is assured.
  - Level of commitment by the evaluation team in the work proposed.
  - Participatory level of the methodology proposed.
  - Integration of the rights and gender approach in the proposal.
  - Sensitivity to local beliefs and customs, religious practices and gender roles.
2. **Make-up of the work team: 40 points**
  - High weighting: Demonstrable experience in making participatory evaluations with a focus on human Rights and gender issues; demonstrable experience in evaluations with Spanish funding agencies (AECID, CAM, etc.); advanced working knowledge of Spanish and the language of the implementation country; knowledge of the in-country situation and intervention sector; skills in research methods and techniques.
  - Moderate weighting: knowledge of the in-country situation; knowledge of the evaluation of Programs; skills in research methods and techniques.

**3. Financial bid submitted: 20 points**

- Precision and efficiency of the financial bid.
- Balance between information-compiling costs, fees, travelling expenses, etc.

In order for the bids submitted to qualify for valuation, evaluation firms/independent assessors must accredit their experience in assessing development-aid Programs, citing any similar work done over the last three years.

Personnel responsible for receiving tenders (send to all):

Staff responsible in Caritas Spain:

Mrs. Noelia de Pablo Torres: [ndepablo.ssgg@caritas.es](mailto:ndepablo.ssgg@caritas.es)

Mr. Martin Lago [mlago.ssgg@caritas.es](mailto:mlago.ssgg@caritas.es)

Mr. Felix Sánchez [FMSANCHEZ.SSGG@caritas.es](mailto:FMSANCHEZ.SSGG@caritas.es)

Staff responsible in Caritas Philippines:

Mark Lupango [hindipasisiil@gmail.com](mailto:hindipasisiil@gmail.com)

Zeny Alamo [ynez\\_am@yahoo.com](mailto:ynez_am@yahoo.com)

Submission method: in writing in digital format