

MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

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 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 to the project not meeting its 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 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 or insufficient experience level of personnel.

MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

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, with no 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 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 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 impact due 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 not meeting 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 results 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 were met with no project delays. Maintenance issues never affected project execution.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	Some aspect of the physical characteristics and capabilities of the ship were not suitable to efficient or effective data collection for this project, but the project objectives were successfully completed. The ship required unscheduled maintenance, but the project was not 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.

MARINE OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	NOAA SHIP	PROJECT START DATE	PROJECT END DATE
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------------	------------------

9. Describe your overall experience on the platform.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	100% or more of the project objectives were met. The crew was professional, efficient and pleasant to work with. Living and working areas were clean, comfortable, efficient, and contributed significantly to a pleasurable experience while on board the ship.
	3 – Met expectations	Most (90% or more) of the project objectives were met. The crew was professional and efficient. Living and working areas were clean and comfortable.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	Some of the project objectives were not met. The crew and the living and working areas were simply adequate.
	1 – Failed to complete the objectives	None of the project objectives were met. The crew was a hindrance to the project and not pleasant to work with. The living and working areas were poorly designed and/or maintained.

10. The platform was safe and the crew reflected a commitment to personal safety and security during shipboard and scientific operations.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	The platform was safe and the crew inspired an above average level of confidence in personal safety and security. At no time did I feel that my life, possessions or scientific instruments were threatened in any way beyond the known risks of life/work at sea.
	3 – Met expectations	The platform was safe and the crew demonstrated their clear commitment to safe operations. I felt that my life, possessions, and scientific instruments were safe and secure knowing the risks of life/work at sea.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	The platform had minor issues that could potentially have compromised safety or security and/or the crew demonstrated less than total commitment towards safety and security policies.
	1 – Failed to complete the objectives	The platform had major issues that seriously compromised personal safety and security and/or the crew took unnecessary risks that could/did jeopardize the safety and security of those on board the platform.

11. Please provide additional comments and recommendations, including explanations for any responses that received a rating of 1 or 2. In addition, use this space to elaborate on actions that exceeded your expectations or failed to meet your expectations, or suggest equipment and system improvements for this ship.