

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368468654>

Standardised and referenced acoustic monitoring reliably estimates bat fatalities at wind turbines: comments on 'Limitations of acoustic monitoring at wind turbines to evaluate fat...

Article in *Mammal Review* · February 2023

DOI: 10.1111/mam.12310

CITATIONS

0

READS

266

21 authors, including:



Oliver Behr

Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nürnberg

27 PUBLICATIONS 733 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Kévin Barré

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle

47 PUBLICATIONS 287 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Fabio Bontadina

Swild - Urban Ecology & Wildlife Research

141 PUBLICATIONS 2,997 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Robert Brinkmann

Freiburg Institute of Applied Animal Ecology

43 PUBLICATIONS 421 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Myotis alcaethoe [View project](#)



Farming practices and biodiversity [View project](#)

COMMENT

Standardised and referenced acoustic monitoring reliably estimates bat fatalities at wind turbines: comments on 'Limitations of acoustic monitoring at wind turbines to evaluate fatality risk of bats'

Oliver BEHR* *OekoFor GbR, Kartäuserstr. 39a, 79102 Freiburg, Germany. Email: behr@oekofo.de*


Kévin BARRÉ *Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO), Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sorbonne Université, CP 135, 57 Rue Cuvier, 75005 Paris, France. Email: kevin.barre@mnhn.fr*

Fabio BONTADINA SWILD – *Urban Ecology & Wildlife Research, Wuhrstr. 12, 8003 Zurich, Switzerland and Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, Zuercherstrasse 111, 8903 Birmensdorf, Switzerland. Email: fabio.bontadina@swild.ch*

Robert BRINKMANN *Freiburger Institut für Angewandte Tierökologie (FRINAT) GmbH, Dunantstraße 9, 79110 Freiburg, Germany. Email: brinkmann@frinat.de*

Markus DIETZ *Institut für Tierökologie und Naturbildung, Waldstraße 19, 35321 Laubach – Gonterskirchen, Germany. Email: markus.dietz@tieroekologie.com*

Thierry DISCA *Biotope, 22 bd Maréchal Foch, 34140 Mèze, France. Email: tdisca@biotope.fr*

Jérémy S. P. FROIDEVAUX  *Biological and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Natural Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, UK. Email: jeremy.froidevaux@stir.ac.uk*

Simon GHANEM *KS-Umweltgutachten, Sanderstraße 28, 12047 Berlin, Germany. Email: sghanem@ks-umweltgutachten.de*

Senta HUEMER *Ökoteam – Institut für Tierökologie und Naturraumplanung OG, Bergmannsgasse 22, 8010 Graz, Austria. Email: huemer@oekoteam.at*

Johanna HURST *Freiburger Institut für angewandte Tierökologie (FRINAT) GmbH, Dunantstraße 9, 79110 Freiburg, Germany. Email: hurst@frinat.de*

Stefan K. KAMINSKY *Kaminsky Naturschutzplanung GmbH, Hauptstraße 35, 97618 Hohenroth, Germany. Email: s.kaminsky@naturschutzplanung.de*

Volker KELM *KS-Umweltgutachten, Sanderstraße 28, 12047 Berlin, Germany. Email: vkelm@ks-umweltgutachten.de*

Fränzi KORNER-NIEVERGELT *Oikostat GmbH, Rothmättli 16, 6218 Ettiswil, Switzerland. Email: fraenzi.korner@oikostat.ch*

Mirco LAUPER SWILD – *Urban Ecology & Wildlife Research, Wuhrstr. 12, 8003 Zurich, Switzerland. Email: mirco.lauper@swild.ch*

Paul LINTOTT *University of the West of England, Coldharbour Lane, Bristol BS16 1QY, UK. Email: paul.lintott@uwe.ac.uk*


Christian NEWMAN *Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, USA. Email: cnewman@epri.com*

Trevor PETERSON *Stantec Consulting Services Inc., Topsham, ME, USA. Email: trevor.peterson@stantec.com*

Jasmin PROKSCH *Kaminsky Naturschutzplanung GmbH, Hauptstraße 35, 97618 Hohenroth, Germany. Email: j.proksch@naturschutzplanung.de*

Charlotte ROEMER *Centre d'Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation, (Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, CNRS, Sorbonne Université), Paris, France and CEFÉ, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, Montpellier, France. Email: charlotte.roemer1@mnhn.fr*

Wigbert SCHORCHT *NACHTaktiv GbR, Häblerstraße 99, 99099 Erfurt, Germany. Email: wigbert.schorcht@web.de*

Martina NAGY*  *Museum für Naturkunde, Leibniz-Institute for Evolution and Biodiversity Science, Invalidenstraße 43, 10115 Berlin, Germany. Email: martina.nagy@mfn.berlin*

Keywords

acoustic monitoring, bats, collision, curtailment, mitigation, mortality, wind turbine

*Correspondence

Received: 27 November 2021

Accepted: 1 December 2022

Editor: NJ

doi: 10.1111/mam.12310

Stichwörter

Akustische Erfassung, Betriebsauflagen, Fledermäuse, Kollision, Mortalität, Vermeidungsmaßnahme, Windenergieanlage

ABSTRACT

Voigt et al. (2021) provide a thorough analysis of the restrictions inherent to the estimation of bat abundance from acoustic surveys, and conclude that limitations of acoustic monitoring impede the reliable evaluation of bat fatalities at wind turbines. We argue that acoustic data recorded at the nacelle of wind turbines have been experimentally validated as a useful and appropriate measure of bat collisions. Therefore, acoustic data can be used to estimate bat fatalities at wind turbines, provided a referenced and standardised protocol for data acquisition and analysis is used.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG IN DEUTSCH

Voigt et al. (2021) zeigen in einer detaillierten Analyse Einschränkungen auf, die sich für die Bestimmung von Fledermausabundanz auf der Grundlage akustischer Erfassungen ergeben, und kommen zu dem Schluss, dass diese Einschränkungen keine zuverlässige Bewertung der an Windkraftanlagen versterbenden Fledermäuse erlauben. Wir argumentieren, dass in Experimenten validiert wurde, dass an der Gondel von Windenergieanlagen aufgezeichnete akustische Daten ein nützliches und geeignetes Maß für Fledermausschlagopfer sind. Daher können akustische Daten zur Abschätzung an Windenergieanlagen zu Tode kommender Fledermäuse verwendet werden, vorausgesetzt, es wird ein referenziertes und standardisiertes Protokoll für die Datenerfassung und -analyse verwendet.

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the mortality of bats at wind turbines is key to their protection. Initially, the number of bats colliding with wind turbines was estimated from carcass searches (e.g. Arnett et al. 2008; based on the assumption that bats colliding with the rotor are unlikely to survive, we use the terms collision, mortality, and fatality interchangeably). However, these searches are time consuming and costly, and estimates can be very imprecise under the conditions encountered, for example, at many sites in Europe (e.g. high rates of carcass removal by scavengers, and low detectability of carcasses – see Brinkmann et al. 2011). Therefore, acoustic surveys at the nacelle (housing bearing the rotor) of wind turbines are increasingly used to assess the number of mortalities and to develop mitigation measures (Behr et al. 2017, Hayes et al. 2019, Peterson et al. 2021).

Voigt et al. (2021) analysed the restrictions inherent to the estimation of bat abundance from acoustic surveys, and concluded that limitations of acoustic monitoring impede the reliable evaluation of bat fatalities at wind turbines. We agree with many of the issues described by Voigt et al. (2021) that result in limitations for the acoustic recording of bats in general (rapid attenuation of ultrasound, acoustic shadow, directionality of calls, effects of trigger settings, and species-dependent detection range and

identification), and appreciate the discussion on the effect of increasing wind-turbine dimensions that render the acoustic estimation of bat abundance and collisions in the rotor-swept area yet more demanding. In our eyes, figure 2 in Voigt et al. (2021), on the acoustic detection range, is an excellent illustration of this complex issue. However, researchers have been aware of these restrictions and, during almost two decades, large efforts have been made to develop methods that extract as much meaningful information as needed from acoustic bat surveys in general and at wind turbines in particular (Appendix S1). The description given by Voigt et al. (2021) of how acoustic data recorded at wind turbines are used to predict and reduce the mortality of bats reflects neither this accumulated knowledge nor the current debate in this field.

RECORDER SENSITIVITY AND DETECTION RANGE

The main argument put forward by Voigt et al. (2021) relates to the distance at which bat calls can be detected by acoustic recorders. To calculate this distance, the authors used a threshold of 60 dB sound pressure level (SPL; the lower the threshold the more sensitive the recorder), which is commonly used with the acoustic recording device ‘Batcorder’ (produced by one of Voigt’s co-authors) at

wind turbines. Other detectors specifically designed to sample bats at wind turbines (BATmode, bioacoustic technology; Batlogger WEX, Elekon) have a substantially lower threshold at 37 dB SPL and thus record much more activity than the Batcorder (Adams et al. 2012, Behr et al. 2018). When compared to figure 2 in Voigt et al. (2021), the detection ranges of these detectors are twice as far as those of the Batcorder, resulting in eight times larger volumes.

Thus, there are detectors that have much larger detection ranges than described by Voigt et al. (2021), while at the same time recording substantially fewer noise signals (Behr et al. 2015, Behr et al. 2018, Table 1, Appendix S2). We do not, however, consider sensitivity and detection ranges as major issues. One reason is that bat activity in the detection range of a microphone installed below the turbine nacelle is much higher than the average in the entire rotor-swept zone, resulting in adequate information to estimate the number of collisions. The reasons for this are, at least in Europe, the decrease in the total activity of all species with the height above ground (Hurst et al. 2017, Wellig et al. 2018, Bach et al. 2020), and the concentration of bats around the nacelle as compared to in free air space at the same height (Cryan et al. 2014, Behr et al. 2015). However, more important than detection range are the standardisation and referencing of acoustic recordings to infer collisions from bat activity at the nacelle (e.g. Peterson et al. 2021).

STANDARDISED AND REFERENCED ACOUSTIC SURVEYS ALLOW FOR A RELIABLE MORTALITY ESTIMATION

Ecological surveys, including acoustic surveys of bats, typically require only a sample of a population (Kenkel et al. 1989). Sampling at wind turbine nacelles is usually extensive compared to sampling in other ecological impact assessments (Appendix S3) and, importantly, typically covers the entire bat activity period continuously – a major advantage since bat activity is often characterised by short peaks that are difficult to predict (Brinkmann et al. 2011). Voigt et al. (2021) argue that acoustic surveys at wind turbines are severely constrained because recorders “cover only approximately 23% of the risk zone for a bat calling at 20 kHz and 4% for a bat calling at 40 kHz”. The statement conveys the impression that more, probably all, bats present in the rotor-swept zone should be recorded. Exhaustive sampling is neither necessary for a turbine shutdown based on real-time bat detection (Hayes et al. 2019) nor necessary in the predictive approach commonly used. Instead, standardised detector measurements are used to assess the level of bat activity and to model relationships between environmental factors and bat activity

at a specific turbine, in order to predict future bat activity and to adapt curtailment accordingly. To account for random, seasonal, and inter-annual effects, bat activity should be sampled during more than one complete season (Krättli et al. 2014, Behr et al. 2018, EUROBATS 2019).

The relevant questions are: which biases affect the sample? How they are accounted for? And how much does actual bat activity deviate from the predictions? In the case of a referenced acoustic method used to measure the mortality of bats at wind turbines, many of the existing biases are accounted for by correlating bat fatalities to the number of acoustic recordings in a large dataset from many turbines, using, for example, mixture models (Fig. 1, Korner-Nievergelt et al. 2013, 2018).

Because the activity at a site is compared to bat activity at reference sites, heterogeneous distribution of bats and other effects specific to wind turbines are accounted for. Thus, the statement by Voigt et al. (2021) that “Nacelle monitoring of bats makes the implicit assumption that the distribution of flight altitudes is uniform within the risk zone” is erroneous.

The reference, however, only fits well if the components of the system do not change. A continuous challenge is posed by the effects of turbines with increasing rotor and tower dimensions – compared, and this is the key point, to the turbines the system has originally been referenced for. Such changes in turbine features should be accounted for by extrapolating bat activity with data-based models (e.g. data on spatial distribution of bats in the rotor-swept zone; Behr et al. 2015) and/or by producing reference data for the new turbine types.

There is, however, an ongoing discussion on the combined effects of rotor size and turbine height: what is the effect of an increasing distance between microphone and rotor tip on the correlation of the recorded acoustic activity and fatality numbers? What happens when rotor diameters increase but turbine height does not and, in consequence, rotor tips reach closer to the ground? Answers could be drawn from detailed information on the vertical distribution of bats which is, so far, available from studies at meteorological towers and cranes (Hurst et al. 2017, Roemer et al. 2017, 2019, Wellig et al. 2018) – we suggest that the vertical distribution of bats at wind turbines should be a future focus in research. Voigt et al. (2021) present a schematic concept on the effect of the vertical distribution of bats on their detectability by recorders installed in the nacelle (fig. 5 in Voigt et al. 2021). However, because they do not mention existing approaches used to relate acoustic measurements from wind turbines to references (acoustic and correlated fatality data), their criticism does not contribute to solving the problems currently encountered in practice.

Table 1. Features of acoustic detectors commonly used to record bats at the nacelle of wind turbines; + = has the feature, – = does not have the feature, +/- = partly has the feature. Comparisons of detector data backup, remote control, and connectivity are shown in Appendix S2

	Anabat Swift ¹	ecoObs GSM Batcorder	elekon Batlogger WE X	Bioacoustic-technology BATmode	Wildlife Acoustics SM4	Wildlife Acoustics SMART
Microphone						
Max. number of microphones	1	1	8	4	2	3–6
Omnidirectional ²	+ ³	+ ³	+ ³	+ ³	+ ³	+ ³
Heating ⁴	–	–	–	+	–	+
Calibration ⁵	–	+	+	+	–	–
Digital signal transfer ⁶	+/- ⁷	–	+/- ⁷	+/- ⁷	+/- ⁷	+
Remote sensitivity check ⁸	- ⁹	+	+	+	–	+/- ¹⁰
Broad band test signal ¹¹	–	–	+ ¹²	+	–	+/- ¹³
Trigger						
Fixed threshold (dB SPL) ⁵	+/- ¹⁴	54, 60, 66, 69 ¹⁵	37 ¹⁶	37 ¹⁶	+/- ¹⁷	+/- ¹⁷
Frequency analysis based on FFT ¹⁸	+/- ¹⁹	+/- ¹⁹	+	+	+	+
Complex bat call filter ²⁰	- ²¹	- ²¹	+	+	+/-	+
Transparent trigger settings ²²	+	–	+	+	+	+

¹The Anabat SD1/SD2, previously used to record zero crossing data of bats at wind turbines, is no longer available. The manufacturer currently recommends the full spectrum recorder Anabat Swift.

²An omnidirectional microphone reduces biases caused by a heterogeneous distribution of bats. The term omnidirectional is an approximation and directionality depends on sound frequency. Installation in the turbine wall reduces the scope of the microphone to a hemisphere.

³Batcorder, Batlogger, BATmode, and SM4 with SMM-U1 microphone all use electret microphones of the FG series produced by Knowles Electronics. The Swift with US-O V3, SM4 with SMM-U2, and the SMART microphones are based on MEMS (Micro Electro-Mechanical System) technology.

⁴Microphone heating greatly reduces effects of rain and temperature on sensitivity and wear.

⁵The use of calibrated microphones and a fixed trigger threshold reduces biases when comparing data from different sites. With a dynamic threshold, changes in the level of background noise cause differences in detector trigger threshold and, in consequence, in the number of bats recorded. Thus, the higher noise level at sites with higher wind speeds will lead to a lower percentage of bats recorded.

⁶A digital signal transfer from the microphone to the recorder reduces the amount of electromagnetic noise signals recorded and, with fibre optic signal transmission, allows for cable lengths between microphone and detector >100 m.

⁷The Swift, Batlogger, BATmode, and SM4 use integrated microphone amplifiers that transmit a differential analogue signal that offers improved resistance to electromagnetic interference as compared to a simple analogue microphone signal, thus allowing for microphone cable lengths of up to 100 m. For the BATmode, a microphone with digital signal transfer is being developed (according to the manufacturer).

⁸A daily remote sensitivity check is required for reliable and referenced recording.

⁹The Swift has a ‘microphone detect’ function that can detect complete microphone failure or cable breakage but not a change in sensitivity.

¹⁰SMART microphones have a redundant backup sensor and a non-calibrated ultrasonic emitter, rendering less information than a calibrated transmitter.

¹¹Ultrasound test-signals are usually produced by piezo elements. The acoustic characteristics of these elements (e.g. peak frequency) are influenced by temperature, which makes broadband test signals more reliable.

¹²Available as firmware update.

¹³The SMART currently uses a narrow-band test signal, but is based on an open platform and could be customised to a broadband test signal.

¹⁴The Swift uses a fixed threshold referenced to the maximum amplitude (in dB FS) but without calibration (in dB SPL).

¹⁵A 42 and 48 dB SPL threshold are being developed (according to the manufacturer). 60 dB SPL (setting –36 dB FS) is the trigger threshold currently recommended when using the Batcorder to record data to be used in the ProBat Software.

¹⁶Other trigger threshold settings can be used, also.

¹⁷For the SM4, a firmware update is available that includes a fixed threshold option (according to the manufacturer). To our knowledge, up to now most users choose the default dynamic threshold option. The SMART uses a dynamic threshold, but a fixed one could be programmed. Wildlife Acoustics offer no calibration service, so any chosen threshold will show fluctuations depending on the specific device, microphone, and microphone condition.

¹⁸Frequency-based triggering with data that have been fast Fourier transformed (FFT) into a sonogram, as opposed to time-signal triggering, reduces noise recordings to a large extent.

¹⁹The Swift and Batcorder both offer a trigger that is partly based on frequency criteria but not on FFT. These frequency criteria do not offer, for example, the increase in signal to noise ratio resulting from FFT analysis (see Appendix S2).

²⁰A complex bat call filter based on multiple parameters mostly from the sonogram (calculated by FFT).

²¹The Swift uses a trigger criterion based on zero-crossing frequency information but not on FFT. Similarly, the Batcorder has a partly frequency-based ‘quality’ criterion and a ‘noise filter’ function, both without publicly available specifications. The ability of these simple frequency criteria to recognise bat calls and to filter noise signals is limited compared to multiple FFT-based criteria. The Batcorder ‘noise filter’ may affect the number of bat calls recorded which could render it incompatible with the settings in the ProBat software.

²²Transparency in bat call recognition, with publicly accessible threshold values.




Fig. 1. The relationship between bat recordings and fatalities at wind turbines. Bat activity, quantified as the number of bat recordings at the nacelle per night with a BATmode recorder averaged over the nights after which carcass searches were performed, predicts bat fatality rates for turbine-years. The black regression line shows the partial effect of acoustic activity on the number of fatalities per night from a hierarchical model that accounted for detection probability and also included average wind speed, nacelle height and rotor diameter as predictors ($R^2 = 0.78$). The grey shading shows the 95% credibility interval. Dot colours indicate sample years (2007 and 2008, 2012, and 2015). Turbines sampled in 2015 had larger rotor diameters than in the previous years. See Appendix S4 for methods and details.

Voigt et al. (2021) state that recorded acoustic data “...are then used to identify the environmental conditions [...] at which bats are most active”. Many curtailment systems are, however, more complex, calling for joint efforts between fundamental and applied research to develop appropriate and feasible solutions. For example, in ProBat (a browser-based online tool used to calculate mitigation algorithms in Central Europe, www.ProBat.org), mortality assessment (probability of collisions) and curtailment decisions are based on the standardised measures of the level of acoustic bat activity, accounting for wind speed, month, time of night, the region of the turbine site, and temperature. To render mortality assessment more robust and less prone to random effects of a small sample size (e.g. extreme weather conditions), the relationships between environmental factors, bat activity and ultimately mortality are informed by a data-base from hundreds of turbines with more than 65000 detector-nights recorded during more than 10 years (Brinkmann et al. 2011, Behr et al. 2015, 2018). Moreover, the effectiveness of the curtailment algorithms resulting from the models has been experimentally validated at 16 turbines from eight sites (Behr et al. 2015). Another example is the TIMR system that uses real time acoustic data in addition to wind speed data (Hayes et al. 2019).

The apparently simple solutions proposed in Voigt et al. (2021), such as the use of additional acoustic detectors, would be of little help since the interpretation of the recorded data is only possible if referenced with data from fatality searches (Appendix S5), as has been done for detectors installed in the bottom of the nacelle (Korner-Nievergelt et al. 2013, Behr et al. 2018). In summary, Voigt et al. (2021) give a very useful overview of the restrictions of acoustic sampling of bat populations in general, but they do not account for the way in which extensive acoustic data are used to predict and reduce the mortality of bats at wind turbines (e.g. Peterson et al. 2021).

We are concerned that stating that there is an unsolved ‘green-green dilemma’ (Voigt et al. 2021), while largely ignoring existing solutions and standards, will be detrimental to bat populations; in the long run, we argue that it could also be detrimental for the development of wind energy, since a unified and accepted standard approach increases planning reliability. Existing approaches to mitigate the impact of wind energy on bat populations based on standardised and referenced acoustic surveys have been shown to be effective and have continuously been improved. We are convinced that these solutions are key to the expansion of renewable energy with limited and tolerable mortality for the bat fauna.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their valuable comments and suggestions, we would like to thank Lothar and Petra Bach and Mirjam Knörnschild (first draft) as well as four anonymous reviewers and Christian Voigt (submitted manuscript). We also want to thank Dean Thompson (Titley Scientific), Fabian Frohn (ecoObs), Marco Gumprich (Elekon), Mona Doss (Wildlife Acoustics), and Thomas Scharrer (bioacoustictechnology) for their detailed feedback on detector features. Many thanks also to Raimund Specht (Avisoft) for his very knowledgeable input on detector details.

Oliver Behr, Robert Brinkmann, Fränzi Korner-Nievergelt, and Martina Nagy have been involved with the development of the ProBat software mentioned in the paper. Oliver Behr is a minor (2.5%) and up to now non-profit associate of bioacoustictechnology, a company producing detectors for the recording of bats at wind turbines.

FUNDING

Funding was provided by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU, funding code 0327638C+D) and the German

Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMW, funding code 0327638E).

REFERENCES

- Adams AM, Jantzen MK, Hamilton RM, Fenton MB (2012) Do you hear what I hear? Implications of detector selection for acoustic monitoring of bats. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3: 992–998.
- Arnett EB, Brown WK, Erickson WP, Fiedler JK, Hamilton BL, Henry TH et al. (2008) Patterns of bat fatalities at wind energy facilities in North America. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 72: 61–78.
- Bach L, Bach P, Kesel R (2020) Akustisches monitoring von rauhautfledermaus an windenergieanlagen: ist ein zweites ultraschallmikrofon am turm notwendig? In: *Evidenzbasierter Fledermausschutz in Windkraftvorhaben*, 101–119. Springer Spektrum, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany.
- Behr O, Brinkmann R, Korner-Nievergelt F, Nagy M, Niermann I, Reich M, Simon R (2015) *Reduktion des Kollisionsrisikos von Fledermäusen an onshore-Windenergieanlagen (RENEBAT II)*. Report to the German federal ministry for the environment. <http://www.repo.uni-hannover.de/handle/123456789/285>. 368 pp.
- Behr O, Brinkmann R, Hochradel K, Mages J, Korner-Nievergelt F, Niermann I et al. (2017) Mitigating bat mortality with turbine-specific curtailment algorithms: a model-based approach. In: Köppel J (ed) *Wind Energy and Wildlife Interactions*, 135–160. Springer, Cham, Switzerland.
- Behr O, Brinkmann R, Hochradel K, Mages J, Korner-Nievergelt F, Reinhard H et al. (2018) *Bestimmung des Kollisionsrisikos von Fledermäusen an Onshore-Windenergieanlagen in der Planungspraxis (RENEBAT III)*. Report to the German Federal Ministry of Economics. <http://windbat.techfak.fau.de/Abschlussbericht/renebat-iii.pdf>
- Brinkmann R, Behr O, Korner-Nievergelt F, Mages J, Niermann I, Reich M (2011) *Entwicklung von Methoden Zur Untersuchung Und Reduktion Des Kollisionsrisikos von Fledermäusen an Onshore-Windenergieanlagen (RENEBAT I)*. Report to the Germany Federal Ministry for the Environment. Cuvillier Verlag, Göttingen, Germany.
- Cryan PM, Gorresen PM, Hein CD, Schirmacher MR, Diehl RH, Huso MM et al. (2014) Behavior of bats at wind turbines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 111: 15126–15131.
- EUROBATS (2019) 24th meeting of the advisory committee, doc.EUROBATS.AC24.5. Rev.1.
- Hayes MA, Hooton LA, Gilland KL, Grandgent C, Smith RL, Lindsay SR et al. (2019) A smart curtailment approach for reducing bat fatalities and curtailment time at wind energy facilities. *Ecological Applications* 29: e01881.
- Hurst J, Biedermann M, Dietz C, Dietz M, Karst I, Krannich E, Petermann R, Schorcht W, Brinkmann R (2017) *Fledermäuse und Windkraft im Wald*. Bundesamt für Naturschutz, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, Germany.
- Kenkel N, Juhász-Nagy P, Podani J (1989) On sampling procedures in population and community ecology. *Vegetatio* 83: 195–207.
- Korner-Nievergelt F, Brinkmann R, Niermann I, Behr O (2013) Estimating bat and bird mortality occurring at wind energy turbines from covariates and carcass searches using mixture models. *PLoS One* 8: e67997.
- Korner-Nievergelt F, Almási B, Hochradel K, Mages J, Naucke A, Nagy M, Simon R, Weber N, Behr O (2018) Weiterentwicklung der statistischen Modelle zur Vorhersage des Kollisionsrisikos von Fledermäusen an WEA aus akustischen Aktivitätsdaten. In: Behr O, Brinkmann R, Hochradel K, Mages J, Korner-Nievergelt F, Reinhard H et al. (eds) *Bestimmung Des Kollisionsrisikos von Fledermäusen an Onshore-Windenergieanlagen in der Planungspraxis (RENEBAT III)*. Report to the German Federal Ministry of Economics, 111–145, Erlangen, Freiburg, Germany, Ettiswil, Switzerland. <http://windbat.techfak.fau.de/Abschlussbericht/renebat-iii.pdf>
- Krättli H, Brossard C, Moeschler P, Magnin B, Bontadina F (2014) Integration of bat conservation concerns in the development of wind energy projects in Switzerland. In: Lina PHC, Hutson AM (eds) *Proceedings of the XIIIth European Bat Research Symposium*, 98. Croatian Biospeleological Society, Šibenik, Croatia.
- Peterson TS, McGill B, Hein CD, Rusk A (2021) Acoustic exposure to turbine operation quantifies risk to bats at commercial wind energy facilities. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 45: 552–565.
- Roemer C, Disca T, Coulon A, Bas Y (2017) Bat flight height monitored from wind masts predicts mortality risk at wind farms. *Biological Conservation* 215: 116–122.
- Roemer C, Bas Y, Disca T, Coulon A (2019) Influence of landscape and time of year on bat-wind turbines collision risks. *Landscape Ecology* 34: 2869–2881.
- Voigt CC, Russo D, Runkel V, Goerlitz HR (2021) Limitations of acoustic monitoring at wind turbines to evaluate fatality risk of bats. *Mammal Review* 51: 559–570.
- Wellig SD, Nusslé S, Miltner D, Kohle O, Glaiot O, Braunisch V, Obrist MK, Arlettaz R (2018) Mitigating the negative impacts of tall wind turbines on bats: vertical activity profiles and relationships to wind speed. *PLoS One* 13: e0192493.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's website.

Appendix S1. References on surveys of the bat activity at wind turbines.

Appendix S2. Additional information on acoustic detectors commonly used to record bats at the nacelle of wind turbines.

Appendix S3. Information on ecological impact assessment at wind turbines.

Appendix S4. Methods for Figure 1.

Appendix S5. Information on a standardised and referenced protocol for acoustic acquisition of bat data at the nacelle of wind turbines.