NOAA Form 57-11-05 (6-12) Page 1 of 4	MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY NATIONAL			DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	NOAA SHIP	PROJECT START DATE	PROJECT END DATE
NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING SURVEY		TITLE OF PERSON COMPLETING SURVEY		DATE SURVEY COMPLETED

Submit completed surveys to: Director, Office of Marine and Aviation Operations

r Fax to:

(301) 713-1541 Attn: Customer Satisfaction Survey

8403 Colesville Road, Suite 500

Silver Spring, MD 20910-6333

or E-mail to:

OMAO.Customer.Satisfaction@noaa.gov

DIRECTIONS: Place a mark in one box for each satisfaction rating criteria. All responses are rated on a scale of 1-4. Use the comments section to explain any rating of 1 or 2.

1. For what percentage of the scheduled project was the platform "mission-ready" (i.e. capable of carrying out the objectives of the project)? Do not include time lost to weather, but do include time lost to platform unreadiness, crewing, unscheduled maintenance or repairs, and equipment or instrumentation failures. The Commanding Officer has ultimate responsibility for setting the platform's estimated time of departure (ETD) and estimated time of arrival (ETA).

A = number of scheduled science days	
B = number of potential hours per day project objectives could be pursued	
C = total number of potential science hours (A x B)	
D = total number of hours lost due to ship not being "mission ready"	
E = percentage of mission ready time [(C-D)/C] x 100	

2. All procedures regarding project preparation (project instructions, logistical coordination, and instrumentation) were reasonable and easy to understand.

4 – Exceeded expectations	Identification and specification of project preparation procedures were handled in an expert, profession manner. Project instructions were developed with a minimum of revision or miscommunication.	
3 – Met expectations	All project preparations were accomplished without adverse project impact.	
2 – Did not meet expectations	Some part of the project preparation under MOC's control caused an impact to the project, but the project objectives were successfully completed.	
1 – Failed to complete the objectives	Some part of the project preparation under MOC's control directly contributed to the project not meeting its objectives.	
N/A	Not Applicable.	

NOAA Form 57-11-05 (6-12) Page 2 of 4	MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY			DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	NOAA SHIP	PROJECT START DATE	PROJECT END DATE

3. I received responses to requests for information from ship personnel in a timely and satisfactory manner.

4 – Exceeded expectations	All responses to requests were received within 3 working days. Follow-up interactions ensured all information to execute a successful project was received.	
3 – Met expectations	All responses were received by set deadline for effective project preparation.	
2 – Did not meet expectations	Responses were delayed on occasion, but the project was not impacted.	
1 – Failed to complete the objectives	Delayed responses caused an impact to the project.	
N/A	Not Applicable.	

4. MOC provided efficient and effective support for the project staging and logistics.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	Project staging, instrumentation, and logistics were handled in an expert, professional manner. All loading, ship or MOC installations, and configuration changes fully conformed to project request and requirements. Non-standard instrument or installation requests were handled to the satisfaction of the User, with additional assistance provided by MOC over and above basic mission requirements.	
	3 – Met expectations	All project staging, instrument installation, and platform configuration changes were accomplished without adverse project impact.	
2 – Did not meet expectations Some part of the staging/loading process or platform modification process under MOC's control cause project objectives were successfully completed.		Some part of the staging/loading process or platform modification process under MOC's control caused an impact to the project, but the project objectives were successfully completed.	
1 – Failed to complete the objectives Some part of the staging/loading process or platform modification process under MOC's control directly contributed meeting it objectives.		Some part of the staging/loading process or platform modification process under MOC's control directly contributed to the project not meeting it objectives.	
	N/A	Not Applicable.	

5. The standard operating procedures and ship policies on ship-to-shore communication, working constraints, and safety procedures were effectively communicated and understood. The ship's crew provided the most efficient and effective support for the accomplishment of the project goals given those constraints.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	The ship's crew clearly communicated their constraints and worked effectively with the Chief Scientist and scientific party to optimize the data collection effort.
	3 – Met expectations	The ship's crew clearly communicated their constraints and accomplished the mission goals efficiently and effectively within those constraints.
2 – Did not meet expectations Project instructions were not executed by the ship's crew or scientific party as planned. Sufficient data were mission, but all mission objectives were not met to complete satisfaction.		Project instructions were not executed by the ship's crew or scientific party as planned. Sufficient data were obtained to complete the mission, but all mission objectives were not met to complete satisfaction.
1 – Failed to complete the objectives Project instructions were not executed as planned. Insufficient data were obtained due to inadequacy of MOC equipment experience level of personnel.		Project instructions were not executed as planned. Insufficient data were obtained due to inadequacy of MOC equipment or insufficient experience level of personnel.

NOAA Form 57-11-05 (6-12) Page 3 of 4	MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY			DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	NOAA SHIP	PROJECT START DATE	PROJECT END DATE

6. The MOC supplied instrumentation and data acquisition systems functioned properly.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	All MOC equipment, instrumentation, and systems performed at or above the level required by the project. All data required for project success was collected and disseminated as requested, within deadlines specified in the project plan. Enhanced or optional equipment and systems performed above the minimum required for a successful project.
	3 – Met expectations All systems functioned within project requirements. Equipment, instrument performance, and data collection were adequate, we project impact due to malfunctioning systems or data loss.	
2 – Did not meet expectations A malfunction or failure in some part of the MOC supplied equipment, instrumentation, or data collection cause but the project objectives were successfully completed.		A malfunction or failure in some part of the MOC supplied equipment, instrumentation, or data collection caused an impact to the project, but the project objectives were successfully completed.
1 – Failed to complete the objectives Some part of the equipment, instrumentation, or data collection under MOC's control directly contributed to the projectives.		Some part of the equipment, instrumentation, or data collection under MOC's control directly contributed to the project not meeting its objectives.
	N/A	Not Applicable.

7. The scientific instrumentation that the users brought on board interfaced well with the platform provided by MOC.

4 – Exceeded expectations	User supplied instrumentation and systems interfaced well with the ship and performed at or above the level required by the project.	
3 – Met expectations	All systems functioned within project requirements. Instrument performance and data collection were adequate, with no project impadue to malfunctioning platform interface.	
2 – Did not meet expectations	A malfunction or failure in some part of the MOC platform interface caused an impact to the project, but the project objectives were successfully completed.	
1 – Failed to complete the objectives Some part of the instrumentation or data collection platform interface under MOC's control directly contributed to the project n its objectives.		
N/A	Not Applicable.	

8. The platform provided by MOC was suitable for effective and efficient completion of the mission.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	The ship's unique modifications, configuration, and characteristics were beyond my expectations of a research platform. Research result were better than expected as a result of platform capabilities. The ship was always in good working order.	
3 – Met expectations The physical characteristics and capabilities of the ship were precisely suited to the project application. All anticipated goals no project delays. Maintenance issues never affected project execution.		The physical characteristics and capabilities of the ship were precisely suited to the project application. All anticipated goals were met with no project delays. Maintenance issues never affected project execution.	
	Some aspect of the physical characteristics and capabilities of the ship were not suitable to efficient or effective data collective. 2 – Did not meet expectations project, but the project objectives were successfully completed. The ship required unscheduled maintenance, but the project significantly impacted.		
	1 – Failed to complete the objectives	Some aspect of the physical characteristics or capabilities of the ship were not suitable to efficient or effective data collection for this project and directly contributed to the project not meeting its objectives. Unscheduled maintenance significantly hindered data collection during the project.	

NOAA Form 57-11-05 (6-12) Page 4 of 4	MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION	
PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	NOAA SHIP	PROJECT START DATE	PROJECT END DATE
. Describe your overall experience on the platform.				
4 – Exceeded expectations		project objectives were met. The crew was professional, efule, efficient, and contributed significantly to a pleasurable		
3 – Met expectations	Most (90% or more) of comfortable.	f the project objectives were met. The crew was profession	nal and efficient. Living and v	working areas were clean and
2 – Did not meet expectations	Some of the project ob	ojectives were not met. The crew and the living and working	ng areas were simply adequa	te.
1 – Failed to complete the objectives		ojectives were met. The crew was a hindrance to the proje igned and/or maintained.	ct and not pleasant to work v	with. The living and working
LO. The platform was safe and the crew reflected a c	commitment to personal safe	ety and security during shipboard and scientific operations.		
4 – Exceeded expectations		and the crew inspired an above average level of confidence scientific instruments were threatened in any way beyond		
3 – Met expectations		and the crew demonstrated their clear commitment to saf and secure knowing the risks of life/work at sea.	e operations. I felt that my l	ife, possessions, and scientific
2 – Did not meet expectations	-	or issues that could potentially have compromised safety o safety and security policies.	r security and/or the crew de	emonstrated less than total
1 – Failed to complete the objectives		or issues that seriously compromised personal safety and so the safety and security of those on board the platform.	ecurity and/or the crew took	unnecessary risks that
		ations for any responses that received a rating of 1 or 2. Ir	addition, use this space to e	elaborate on actions that
exceeded your expectations of failed to ffieet you	ar expectations, or suggest e	quipment and system improvements for this ship.		