



# NFWF

## **NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION**

1625 Eye Street, N.W. Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20006

P 202-857-0166 | 202-857-0162 | [nfwf.org](http://nfwf.org)

### **Request for Quotations: Support for Transaction Monitoring & Evaluation Effectiveness Q&A**

**Q:** Task 3, RM&E Analysis #5 (ESA critical habitat spatial analysis): Is this a new analysis for FY26, or a continuation of prior spatial work? If new, what level of depth is expected — a basin-wide overlay, or reach-level analysis for every active transaction?

**A:** This is a continuation of prior spatial work. Generally, this would be at the subbasin level (ex: Yakima, Upper Salmon, etc.).

**Q:** Task 3, Analysis #6 (Literature review): What is the expected scope — a comprehensive review across all active-transaction subbasins, or targeted to a subset? Is there a prior review we should build on, or is this expected to be developed from scratch?

**A:** This review will cover all subbasins with active transactions and additional focal areas as determined by NFWF and the consultant. The review will be built on prior reviews conducted in previous Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation (RM&E) reports.

**Q:** Task 2, Data Management System Updates: Are the five examples intended to represent the full expected scope of updates required during the period of performance? Or is there the possibility that NFWF will identify further updates required during FY27? Is NFWF open to proposers recommending additional or alternative enhancements in the technical approach?

**A:** There is a possibility that NFWF will identify further updates in FY27. NFWF is also open to recommended enhancements to the data management system or technical processes outlined in the scope of work.

**Q:** Does the DMS currently store binary large objects (BLOBs) like imagery (e.g., scanned maps, pdfs, photos) directly, or does it serve as a metadata repository linking to an S3 bucket or similar external storage?

**A:** The DMS serves as a metadata repository linking to an S3 bucket.

**Q:** From past experience, do QLE's require formal DMS training and/or frequent, extensive technical support (e.g., program-wide support required daily or weekly), or is the expected level of technical support more modest (e.g., program-wide support required weekly or monthly)?

**A:** Technical support is seasonal based on the program's ongoing activities. During quarterly transaction proposal submission periods and before CBWTP's annual monitoring

data submission due date, technical support is requested at least weekly and sometimes daily. Outside of these periods, technical support is minimal.

**Q:** What is the current technology stack of the DMS (e.g., PostgreSQL/MySQL backend, React frontend, API layer)? Additionally, are there existing CI/CD pipelines or automated testing frameworks in place?

**A:** The current technology stack of the DMS is a MySQL backend and a React/Django frontend. There are no existing CI/CD pipelines or testing frameworks in place specific to the scope of work, but the current consultant uses their own organization's CI/CD testing frameworks to conduct contracted activities.

**Q:** Can NFWF share an example of "Analyzing and Measuring spatial relationships between Critical Habitat, ESA listed species, priority species and water transactions"? For example, are there common or preferred metrics to support individual transaction level and basin-wide summaries?

**A:** One example is overlaying critical habitat spatial data with spatial point-data for CBWTP's transactions to observe overlap between the program's transactions and nearby ESA-listed aquatic species. Another is comparing the program's observed flow in various stream reaches with collected metrics for protected water to quantify the amount of flow observed that came from water contracted by CBWTP.

**Q:** Does NFWF have an example of recent "program evaluation and adaptive management" actions that have been implemented to improve efficiency and effectiveness within the CBWTP program's work?

**A:** A recent example was the previous monitoring consultant performing a review of all submitted compliance monitoring data to identify program-wide deficiencies and propose solutions to NFWF. The previous consultant and NFWF agreed on a plan to address the identified deficiencies and worked together to implement a new policy that resulted in higher quality compliance monitoring data submissions.

**Q:** Can NFWF provide or share examples of FY24 or FY25 RM&E reports, so that potential contractors can better understand current reporting status, reporting styles, preferred metrics, and similar information to ensure future reporting consistency, efficiency, and increased value added to the final deliverables.

**A:** Yes, we can provide directly via email upon request.

**Q:** Is this RFQ a re-compete or extension of a previously awarded monitoring and evaluation contract, such as the Transaction Monitoring & Evaluation Effectiveness contract originally solicited in 2021?

**A:** This RFQ is a re-compete of the previously awarded Transaction Monitoring & Evaluation Effectiveness contract originally solicited in 2021. However, some portions of the scope have changed since that time to better reflect the current needs of NFWF's CBWTP.

**Q:** Is the Technical Approach the same as the Workplan Narrative (referenced on e-Page 7)?

**A:** Yes, the workplan narrative referenced on page 7 of the RFQ is the explanation of the proposer's technical approach.

**Q:** Can you confirm what database is referenced throughout the RFQ (i.e. CBdatabase)?

**A:** The database referred to in the RFQ is CBWTP's water transaction database, which is a relational database that hosts the program's water transaction proposals, documents, and monitoring data.

**Q:** The RFQ states that the selected contractor must host and maintain the existing CBWTP data management system, currently hosted on AWS. Can NFWF clarify what database documentation (source code, schema, etc.) and transition support will be made available to the selected contractor at project kickoff?

**A:** All documentation and information required for a selected contractor to transition support from the current contractor will be made available, including source code and support documentation.

**Q:** For the analysis of net change to instream flow, proportion of observed flows protected, progress toward flow targets, and spatial relationships with species/critical habitat, should we assume existing FRAF methods are prescribed, or may we propose methodological refinements where appropriate?

**A:** While the FRAF is prescribed by default, there is room for proposed methodological refinements.

**Q:** For purposes of estimating the level of effort for Task 3, can NFWF provide general information on the number of active transactions, QLEs, database users, and monitoring records?

**A:** There are roughly 250 active transactions, 10 QLEs, 50 database users, and 520 monitoring records.

**Q:** The RFQ asks the contractor to incorporate QLE perspectives on assessed program effectiveness. Does NFWF envision this as structured interviews, surveys, annual debriefs, TAC/QLE meeting discussion, or some other option?

**A:** NFWF will solicit the majority of QLE feedback via surveys and annual meetings throughout the year, and will relay all necessary feedback to the contractor.