



PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

205 SE Spokane Street, SUITE 100, Portland, OREGON 97202
PHONE (503) 595-3100 FAX (503) 595-3232

Electronic Monitoring Systems for Alaska Pot Gear Vessels

Questions and Answers

10/21/16

Question 1: Could you please indicate the areas where the boats are fishing?

Answer: For the purposes of the RFP assume the vessels fish from the ports of Kodiak, Homer, and Sand Point.

Question 2: How many days the boats are normally at port for installation purposes?

Answer: This is a new project. As such, there is not a 'normal' time in port for installation. For the purposes of this RFP assume vessels are in port for 24-48 hours.

Question 3: What is the average for temperatures outside the boat?

Answer: Assume average temperatures are at the long term averages for offshore waters of SE Alaska.

Question 4: Do you have local people to help us with any process?

Answer: PSMFC is not providing local support.

Question 5: How do you normally contact a boat if you need it?

Answer: In Alaska PSMFC works with Contractor staff who knows more of the day-to-day details of a vessel's whereabouts.

Question 6: Who will be the group of coordination for ETA and ETD for boats?

Answer: I'm not certain I understand the question. If the question is who is responsible for coordinating with the vessels for installs/uninstalls, service calls, etc., that is the job of the Contractor.

Question 7: Do the 9 boats from January through June have fixed homeports or they sail between ports?

Answer: For the purposes of this RFP assume both. They have a home port (Kodiak, Homer, or Sand Point) and may land at ports other than their home port.

Question 8: How long does a boat typically stay in port between trips?

Answer: For the purpose of this RFP, you should assume vessels are in port 24-48 hours between trips.

Question 9: Where will be the place for sending the HDDs with videos for reviewing?

Answer: PSMFC in Portland, Oregon

Question 10: Do those boats provide any kind of support on welding jobs if need or is it something anything we should arrange to get from an outside company?

Answer: The winning Contractor should expect to work with the vessels on welding and other tasks necessary for the install and uninstall of the equipment. PSMFC does not provide these services.

Question 11: What is the AC and DC power for those kind of boats?

Answer: It varies between boats. The EM system needs to be capable of accommodating input power voltages from 10V – 32V DC and 110V AC. In addition, the EM system should utilize uninterrupted power supply or other system to allow data to be continually logged during power fluctuations or short power outages

Question 12: Where is the place for the shipment of new units and un-install terminals?

Answer: As noted above, for the purposes of this RFP assume the installs/uninstalls will happen in the ports of Kodiak, Homer, and Sand Point.

Question 13: Is it necessary to be established in USA or be a USA company to present a proposal or win the contract?

Answer: The Contractor or their sub-contractors must be able to work legally within the USA.

Question 14: Is the Hard drive retrieval period a fixed value (twice/month) or can it be fixed differently if the system supports more storage capacity?

Answer: For the purposes of this RFP the retrieval periods should be a fixed value. The issue is, while larger hard drives can be used to accommodate more sea days, these data will be used for in-season management. As such, delaying retrieval of the hard drives makes the video data less valuable and not acceptable for this project at this time.

Question 15: In order to customize the onboard equipment. Which are the main objective data? digital video recording of the entire gear retrieval and fish handling event for all fishing events from each designated vessel.

trip and haul metadata (location, date, time, etc.),

catch and species data.

sensor and video gap information, etc.

Is it necessary to include:

- Target species Catch estimation? species?number?weight?
- Bycatch estimations, species?number? weight?Fate?
- Discards estimations, species?number?weight?...?
- Transhipments, species?number?weight?

Answer: The onboard equipment should be capable of recording all the data listed above. The review software should expedite processing of the video.

Question 16: In order to offer a customized video reviewing software and also propose a data reviewing plan:

- 1) How long can it take to review each trip?
- 2) What % of recorded sets/trips/boats is expected to be reviewed by PSMFC staff?
- 3) How many people is expected to review the footage?
- 4) Will it be necessary to have a third party review video footage?

Answer: 1) All review will be done by PSMFC staff and the goal is to be able to review video as efficiently as possible, while still maintaining accuracy. The review length can vary and is a function of a number of things including size of haul, crew handling procedures, diversity of species caught, and day or night fishing.

- 2) **PSMFC expects to review 100% of the fish handling events.**
- 3) **The expected number of camera reviewers is between 1 and 4.**
- 4) **It is not necessary to have a third party review video footage beyond the high level scans described in the RFP and in this document.**

Question 17: Should Appendix A, which provides the names, titles and hourly rates of key personnel, be attached to the Technical Proposal or the Price Proposal?

Answer: Since it deals directly with billing costs, we anticipate that it would be included with the Price Proposal but either works.

Question 18: One of the assumptions for estimating the program's cost is:

- *High level scans of hard drives will be completed by Contractor staff or designee at each retrieval for data quality, missing data, etc.*

Does this assumption require that there be Contractor staff or subcontractors in each of the three ports to retrieve data and conduct an initial scan on board the vessel?

Could the “high level scan” be carried out by skippers running a scan of the data before it is removed from the vessel? Or scanned at the Contractor’s office prior to being sent to PSMFC?

Answer: The scans can be completed by Contractor staff or designee. The skipper could run the scan if the proposed solution supports that with the understanding that the ultimate responsibility of that review is on the shoulders of the Contractor. Shipping the drives to a Contractor’s office for scans and reshipping to PSMFC will potentially add time and delays to the review process. In the interest of cost savings and if this is the proposed solution, please provide an estimate of the additional time for this extra step. This added delay will be considered when scoring candidates. It is important to note that no copies of digital video recordings, sensor information, location data or other confidential vessel data collected during the execution of these tasks be retained by the Contractor without the written consent of PSMFC.

Question 19: A second assumption for estimating the program’s cost is:

- *Status report provided by Contractor staff or designee to vessel operator and PSMFC on issues each time hard drives are retrieved.*
- 1) What information should be included in the “status report”?
 - 2) Is there a format that could be provided as an example?
 - 3) What is the timeframe for providing the report to PSMFC?

Answer: 1) The types of data provided on a status report would include high level information like operator and vessel name, vessel ID, trip start and end dates, trip start and end ports, number of fishing days on the hard drive, whether the effort and IPHC logs were submitted, whether the function tests were run as required. Based on a small sample of the video additional information provided includes whether all fish handling occurred within camera view, whether discarding happened at designated control points, scoring of image quality (high, medium, low).

2) There is no report template. PSMFC would be glad to work with the Contractor to develop a template.

3) Drive reports should be delivered to PSMFC prior to hard drive delivery. These will likely be e-mail attachments or reports submitted to an ftp site.

Question 20: The cost assumptions in the RFP calls for hardware, software, and field services for 15 vessels (5 vessels each in Homer, Kodiak, and Sand Point). It further describes the expected fishing activity:

6 boats fishing from Sept through December

9 boats fishing from January through June.

Should we assume that the systems installed on the 9 boats fishing from January through June would be removed, and six of those systems reinstalled on the 6 boats expected to fish Sept through December?

Answer: Yes

Question 22: Will PSMFC be providing all of the hard drives for this project, or will these need to be provided by the Contractor?

Answer: For the purposes of this RFP assume the Contractor is providing hard drives.

Question 23: Is the January through June fishery in Homer, Kodiak and Sand Point - which will involve 9 vessels - in the 2017 year (start January 2017)? And if so what day in January is expected to be the start date?

The RFP states "installation shall occur as early as early as 30 days and as few as 3 days prior to the vessel commencing commercial fishing." How soon following the contract award do you anticipate that the systems will need to be installed?

Answer: Yes, the program is expected to start in early January 2017. For the purposes of this RFP assume there will be a minimum of 30 days from the selection of the RFP Contractor and the start date of the fishery.

Question 23: The RFP states "The Contractor shall remove the electronic monitoring equipment from each of the designated vessels once the vessel has completed fishing or after a pre-designated time period (here after as selected fishing period). The Contractor shall remove the equipment without damage to the vessel and restore the vessel to its previous condition within two weeks."

Should the Contractor plan that the cameras will be recycled (i.e. moved from vessel to vessel) during the contract period?

Answer: Yes, cameras will be moved between vessels.

Question 24: Does the PSMFC intend to assume ownership of the cameras following the contract period or will the Contractor retain ownership of the equipment at the end of the contract period?

Answer: For the purposes of this RFP assume PSMFC will retain ownership of all equipment including hardware, software and peripherals.

Question 25:

If the PSMFC will assume ownership of the camera systems, where will the Contractor need to ship the equipment after the contract?

Answer: For the purposes of this RFP assume equipment will be shipped to PSMFC Portland.

Question 26:

The RFP states "Contractor will provide PSMFC with Windows-based review tools with which to review video and capture trip and haul metadata (location, date, time, etc.), as well as catch and species data, sensor and video gap information, etc. Preference will be given to that software which is integrated with vessel sensors which collect information/metadata on hydraulic pressure readings, vessel speed and direction, and other identifying data which expedite the process of quickly identifying the start, end, and location of fishing trips and hauling activity. The Contractor should demonstrate how their integrated solution supports the video review and data recording processes."

- a. Is PSMFC interested in EM video review tools only or would they prefer a proposal that includes an electronic reporting (ER) tool for fishermen to report catch, effort, and fishing activity information. This ER tool would be combined with an EMR (electronic monitoring and reporting) review software that combines EM and ER streams to audit the industry self-reported data.

Answer: As described in the RFP, for the purposes of this RFP assume PSMFC prefers a Windows-based review tool with which to review video and capture trip and haul metadata (location, date, time, etc.) as well as catch and species data, sensor and video gap information, etc.

Question 27:

Is fast HD still photography (up to 1/sec) instead of video acceptable as long as all of the fishing activity, fish handling activity, and images of fish are clear and identifiable?

Answer: Still photography, if it captures the necessary information, would be acceptable.

Question 28:

The RFP indicates that systems will be installed on 9 vessels from January to June and that fishing activity will be monitored for 2-4 month periods of time. Should the contractor plan that at some point between January and June the systems on the 9 vessels will need to be removed for a period of time then reinstalled?

Answer: The vessel counts and dates are examples of vessel monitoring needs for this program. Exact details on the number of vessels and length of time systems will be installed on a single vessel are still being considered. Having said that, prospective bidders should assume that systems would be uninstalled and reinstalled on different vessels.

Question 29:

Will the Contractor be responsible for identifying industry participants?

Answer: No. For the purposes of this RFP assume NMFS AKR and AFSC will identify vessels.

Question 30:

Should the pricing include incentives to facilitate industry compliance with operating and maintaining the equipment at sea?

Answer: No.

Question 31:

Will you please verify the period of performance?

Answer: January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017.

Question 32:

On the subject of being available to "Provide logistical support assistance as necessary for these fisheries", due to the lack of specificity of what this may entail e.g. support for "design", is this element a required part of the financial bid or possible to be a variable amendment depending on engagement? Or are more details on scope of these services available?

Answer: Providing logistical support as necessary for these fisheries entails sufficient staff to install, uninstall, service and support vessels as needed throughout the course of their EM deployment. Field services for this project would fall on the Contractor and staff.

In terms for support for "design", there may be times when testing of new methodologies may be required at the discretion of PSMFC. On these cases, PSMFC would draw on the expertise of the Contractor to help develop and design solutions to these same problems. In these instances, PSMFC would develop a task list to be added to the existing subcontract.