Tuesday, January 21, 2020

RFP 19CRDLWBKPOOL-0004 Questions & Answers

Question: The previous acoustic analysis conducted on this dataset determined presence/absence for northern long-eared bats, Indiana bats, and little brown bats. Will we be able to rely on the original analysis to conduct more efficient qualitative ID and to quantify the number of calls of each target species? In other words, if a night was reviewed in the original analysis and none of the target species were determined to be present, can we conclude for the current analysis that the target species were likely absent, conclude that the number of calls from each species is zero, and skip any further analysis for that night.

Answer: Acoustic data were collected and analyzed following USFWS guidelines as appropriate for the year of collection (2016-2018). In 2019, the data were manually vetted for presence/probable absence (P/A) of MYSE. The data and reports from previous analyses as provided by previous Contractors will be made available for use in this analysis. The Contractor should exercise best professional judgment in use of this information and should present detailed proposals for how it is being used to accomplish the tasks described in the RFP to answer the questions put forth in the RFP.

Question: Northern long-eared bat calls were quantified (i.e. relative abundance was determined) in the original acoustic analyses of these data. Can we use those numbers for the current analysis without any additional manual review?

Answer: No. There was no manual vetting of the original acoustic analysis (data collected and analyzed 2016-2018). Additionally, the number of calls was not reported in the 2019 analysis (manual vetting for MYSE). Task 2 in this RFP is looking specifically for call abundance of species of interest according to manual vetting.   The data and reports from previous analyses as provided by previous Contractors will be made available for use in this analysis.

Question: Task two requests a summary table of "where the manual vetting and the automated classifiers agree or disagree on the classification of MYSE, MYSO, MYLU, and PESU, at the call file level". Can you provide more detail on what you are looking for. For example we could most efficiently provide a table of calls manual review classifies as MYSE, MYSO, MYLU and PESU compared to those classified by automated classifiers. But providing a spreadsheet that included all call files with annotations for each describing justification for each classification and reclassification would be much more time consuming.

Answer: The summary table does not need to have justification for each call classification/reclassification. However, the narrative must clearly describe the methods used for distinguishing each of the species of interest. The summary table does need to include, at a minimum, items discussed in the RFP (e.g., site, date, software spp id, manual vetting spp id, etc.).

Question: How many automated classifiers would need to be used? Could we rely on the output of a single automated classifier? Using one classifier would be more efficient, save time and reduce cost.

Answer: Per USFWS guidelines, the use of one automated classifier is acceptable. However, the contractor is free to propose, based on professional judgement, which and how many USFWS approved automated classification programs to use.

Question: specifically the Statement of Work description in section 4.2. How does this relate to RFP 19CRDLWBKPOOL0001-0001? The implication is that Task 1 does not involve MYSE, so can we presume that this work was completed under the earlier RFP and its conclusions will be available for the completion of Task 2? However, Task 2 seems to involve running the analysis by Auto ID again to make comparisons including for MYSE. Is that what is intended? Does this mean Task 2 would involve manual vetting of MYSE records?

Answer: RFQ 19CRDLWBKPOOL0001-0001 determined P/A for MYSE. Therefore MYSE was not included in Task 1. The report will be made available to the successful Contractor. However, that analysis did not report on call abundance for MYSE, which is necessary for completion of Task 2. A copy of the results spreadsheets from previous automated analyses will be available to the successful Contractor, if desired, however, the completeness and accuracy of that output as applicable to Task 2 is not guaranteed. Task 2 does involve manual vetting of MYSE records.

Question: what is meant by "abundance" as used in Task 2? And what does it mean to "confirm relative abundance"? Can I take it that abundance refers to the numbers of files confirmed by manual vetting for each species at each site, and relative abundance implies a comparison of rates of detection by the different Auto ID suites ? "Abundance" in terms of numbers of bats, can not be inferred using this approach, since there is no way to tell if multiple files were made by the same or different bats.

Answer: Abundance is the context of Task 2 refers to the number of call files classified as a species of interest. Relative abundance in the context of Task 2 is the comparison of the number of call files of the species of interest among sites. The intent is not to infer numbers of bats but rather consider relative activity among sites.

Question: What is the reasoning for allowing subsampling of MYLU but not other species? Does this specifically mean the subsampling of MYLU as reported by Kaleidoscope, for example?

Answer: Due to the number of MYLU calls identified by the automated programs, we are uncertain of the feasibility of vetting every MYLU call. If feasible, manually vetting all MYLU is preferred. If a subsampling approach can be used to confidently answer the question of relative MYLU bat activity among sites, more efficiently, then it would be acceptable. The Contractor should use best professional judgment in developing and presenting a subsampling design in the proposal. As per Attachment 5 (Payment Terms: Cost Proposal), the DNR reserves the right to award Task 2 on a per 1,000 calls basis.