RFP: Western North Carolina Recovery and Resiliency Fund

Process Evaluation

Please find consolidated answers to the questions we received regarding this RFP below. The deadline for proposal submissions is Friday, January 30 at 6pm EST.

To submit a proposal, please email both:

Austin Snowbarger

Director of Strategy and Research

Austin.snowbarger@disasterphilanthropy.org

Bailey Fohr

Strategy and Research Associate

Bailey.fohr@disasterphilanthropy.org

Received Question	CDP Response
Budget	
With a $30,000 starting budget, which phases, deliverables, or evaluation questions does CDP consider most important when making trade-offs? We want to focus resources where they will provide the most learning and practical value for future funding.	We expect proposals to include the proposed approach for answering all the evaluation questions. We also expect the selected consultant(s) to provide the deliverables outlined in the RFP. For this evaluation, we anticipate the desk review will be the primary methodology making that phase critical to the evaluation.
We do not see cost proposal specifications in the RFP, although we note that the proposal should include: "Budget cost, including the anticipated number of work days for each phase." Would CDP like to see a deliverables table that reflects evaluation phases and totals the $30,000 budget, or does CDP have another preference with more budget detail?	From the proposals, we want to understand how the consultant(s) anticipates spending time and resources to achieve the evaluation goals. In addition to a total budget figure, a break down by each phase and/or in a way that the consultant(s) feels helps us with this understanding is welcome.
Project Design	
To accurately scope this phase, could you confirm if CDP has existing rubrics to measure the "quality" and "effectiveness" of Fund design? If not, is the consultant expected to develop these indicators —	We do not have existing "rubrics" but do have an understanding of what we believe to be a quality and effective fund design that we will share with the selected consultant(s). We welcome your recommendation for how

Received Question	CDP Response
specifically the quantitative and qualitative rubrics used to differentiate between "positive" and "negative" management and execution?	to best assess the fund and answer the evaluation questions, including whether developing a rubric or indicators is needed.
Are there specific aspects of the Fund's design or execution that you're especially interested in exploring through this evaluation?	The evaluation questions detail the areas we are interested in exploring through this evaluation. Specifics will be discussed between the selected consultant(s) and CDP staff including the fund management team.
Does CDP have a process or a go-to entity for handling IRB?	We do not.
Desk Review Phase	
What documentation and data related to the WNC Recovery & Resiliency Fund will be available to the evaluator (e.g., grant applications, reporting materials, internal decision documents), and to what extent does CDP anticipate the evaluation relying on synthesis of existing materials versus generating new primary data? Understanding that desk review will be the primary component of this evaluation, what types of information will be made available for review?	CDP has detailed and relevant documentation about the fund that will be provided to the evaluation partner to assist the desk review. During this phase of the evaluation, starting with existing materials is recommended and then supplementing with secondary sources if required.
How many grants do CDP staff anticipate will be awarded from the Fund by April 2026?	A minimum of 38 grants will be awarded by April 2026.
Primary data collection	
For the primary data collection phase, can CDP clarify the anticipated scope of access to external stakeholders (e.g., grantee partners, funders, local intermediaries in Western North Carolina), and whether CDP will support introductions and recruitment? To ensure our proposal reflects the necessary timeline and level of effort, please clarify the expected scale of stakeholder engagement. Does CDP have a target number and specific categories of stakeholders (e.g., grantees, business leaders, local government)? Additionally, please confirm if the consultant is responsible for lead outreach and whether in-person engagement in Western North Carolina is a requirement.	We want to be part of the decision on who to engage for primary data collection. While we expect the consultant to drive and manage data collection outreach, CDP will help facilitate introductions as appropriate. We do not have a target number of stakeholders or specific categories already established. For this evaluation, we anticipate that the desk review will be the primary methodology. It is not anticipated that travel or in-person engagement will be necessary for this evaluation. The primary focus is on the fund's design and execution.

Received Question	CDP Response
Does CDP envision the process evaluation including direct engagement with funded grantee organizations (e.g., interviews or facilitated reflection), engagement with community members or beneficiaries served by those grantees, OR primarily a focus on CDP's internal grantmaking and learning processes?	
Deliverables	
Regarding the final internal report, could you provide the projected scope, such as a preliminary table of contents and an estimated page count for the final submission?	We encourage proposals to include information and proposed ideas about the deliverables. More specifics, such as length and content, will be determined in consultation with the selected consultant. However, we recognize that attention spans are short and in order to be effective, deliverables will need to balance comprehensiveness with conciseness.
Does the evaluation aim to focus exclusively on the design and implementation of the fund, or should it also include understanding the impact of the fund?	Given that this is a process evaluation, our primary focus is on the fund's design and implementation. The evaluation will not assess the impact of the fund.
For budgeting and planning purposes, what level of detail is CDP looking for in deliverable #5, the "external resource"?	At this stage, CDP does not have a fixed level of detail or format defined for the external resource. We anticipate working closely with the selected consultant to determine the scope, audience and format for this deliverable based on evaluation findings and learning priorities. For proposal and budgeting purposes, we welcome consultants to suggest and briefly justify a recommended approach and an appropriate level of effort, with the understanding that the final scope will be refined in partnership with CDP once the project is underway.
External Audiences	
Beyond internal learning, are there particular external audiences CDP hopes to reach through the slide deck or external resource?	We welcome the possibility that our research is applicable and useful to the larger philanthropic field. Primary external audiences are philanthropic organizations, particularly those that are grantmakers or intermediaries.
For the "external resource" deliverable, does CDP have a preferred primary audience (e.g., disaster funders, community foundations, intermediaries) or format (toolkit, learning brief, guidance	Primary external audiences are philanthropic organizations, particularly those that are grantmakers or intermediaries. We will work together with the selected consultant(s) to determine the final external resource format

Received Question	CDP Response
memo), or should the consultant propose and justify a recommended option?	but we welcome the consultant's recommendation for the most appropriate format in the proposal, along with a brief justification for how the proposed approach would effectively support field learning and education based on the evaluation findings.
Equity	
CDP emphasizes racial and intersectional equity throughout the RFP. Are there specific equity frameworks, indicators, or internal practices CDP would like the evaluation to explicitly assess or reflect in the final report and external resource? Are there specific equity related learning considerations that CDP would like the evaluation to address in greater depth?	There are not specific equity frameworks that we expect the evaluation to assess. We will discuss with the selected consultant(s) how we applied equity in the management and execution of the fund and expect this lens to be embedded across the evaluation.
Etc.	
Given that 'every day is disaster season' and CDP staff and grantees may need to respond to emerging disasters during the evaluation period, is there flexibility if this creates scheduling or bandwidth challenges for the project?	CDP acknowledges that disasters are unpredictable and may require us to be flexible in our timeline. That said, we are committed to this project timeline and expect the deliverables to be provided as outlined in the RFP unless otherwise agreed.
I noted that some other funds have been evaluated in the past (Hurricane Harvey Fund and the Midwest Early Recovery Fund). Is CDP wanting to use an evaluation rubric or framework that is similar (or the same), to improve comparability of findings, or will this consultancy create a new framework?	Previous evaluations may have included aspects of fund management and execution but were not the primary focus. This process evaluation is therefore different from those past efforts and will require distinct rubrics or frameworks. Rather than prescribing a methodology, we encourage proposals to include a proposed methodology as part of the thumbnail scope and project approach
Is this fund a pilot or exemplar program for CDP?	We would not describe the fund as a pilot but recognize it is a significant investment in disaster recovery following a major disaster event. Therefore, the fund provides a unique opportunity to not only support affected communities but also learn from its design and execution.
When the project concludes, what would success look like from CDP's perspective?	The agreed upon deliverables have been provided on-time and answer the evaluation questions. CDP has learned new information about its execution and management of the fund, and the evaluation results provide us with actionable information that can be used to strengthen our fund management. The selected consultant(s) has been communicative and collaborative throughout.