

## AVIATION OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

PROJECT NAME	PROJECT NUMBER	NOAA AIRCRAFT	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 or Fax to: (301) 713-1541 Attn: Customer Satisfaction Survey  
 8403 Colesville Road, Suite 500 or E-mail to: OMAO.Customer.Satisfaction@noaa.gov  
 Silver Spring, MD 20910-6333

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.

- Weather permitting, for what percentage of the scheduled/needed project hours was the platform “mission-ready” (i.e. capable of carrying out the objectives of the project)? Include time lost to platform unreadiness, crewing, unscheduled maintenance or repairs, and equipment or instrumentation failures. The Aircraft Commander Officer has ultimate responsibility for setting the platform’s estimated time of departure (ETD) and estimated time of arrival (ETA).

A = number of scheduled project hours	
B = total number of hours lost to platform not being “mission ready”	
C = percent mission ready time [ ( A - B ) / A ] x 100	

- 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, professional manner. Action plan was created and executed with a minimum of revision or miscommunication.
	3 – Met expectations	All project preparations and funding issues were accomplished without adverse project impact.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	Some part of the project preparation under AOC’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 AOC’s control directly contributed to the project not meeting its objectives.
	N/A	Not Applicable.

## AVIATION OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

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

3. I received responses to requests for information from AOC personnel (project coordinator, engineer, or aircraft commander) 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 by the appropriate program personnel.
	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. AOC provided efficient and effective support for the approval and installation of project instrumentation, configuration of the aircraft interior, or provided effective grounds and facilities support.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	Installation of project instrumentation or modification of the aircraft, or logistical requirements was handled in an expert, professional manner. All installations and configuration changes fully conformed to project request and requirements, and all materials were on hand when required or immediately acquired to support the project. Non-standard instrument, installation, or logistics requests were handled to the satisfaction of the User, with additional assistance provided by AOC over and above basic mission requirements.
	3 – Met expectations	All logistical requirements were provided or all instrument installation and aircraft configuration changes were accomplished without adverse project impact.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	Some part of the installation process, aircraft modification process, or logistics requirements under AOC'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 installation process, aircraft modification process, or logistics requirements under AOC's control directly contributed to the project not meeting its objectives.
	N/A	Not Applicable.

5. The flight crew effectively communicated the constraints of the FAA, AOC Operations Manual, and maintenance requirements. The flight crew provided the most efficient and effective support for the accomplishment of the project goals given those constraints.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	The flight crew clearly communicated their constraints and worked effectively with the Principal Investigator to optimize the data collection effort.
	3 – Met expectations	The flight crew clearly communicated their constraints and accomplished the mission goals efficiently and effectively within those constraints.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	Predefined mission profiles were not executed 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	Predefined mission profiles were not executed as planned. Insufficient data were obtained due to inadequacy of AOC equipment or insufficient experience level of personnel.

## AVIATION OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

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

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

	4 – Exceeded expectations	All AOC 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. 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 AOC supplied 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 instrumentation or data collection under AOC’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 AOC.

	4 – Exceeded expectations	User supplied instrumentation and systems interfaced well with the aircraft 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 AOC 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 AOC’s control directly contributed to the project not meeting its objectives.
	N/A	Not Applicable.

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

	4 – Exceeded expectations	The aircraft’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 aircraft was always in good working order.
	3 – Met expectations	The physical characteristics and capabilities of the aircraft 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 aircraft were not suitable to efficient or effective data collection for this project, but the project objectives were successfully completed. The aircraft 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 aircraft 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.

## AVIATION OPERATIONS SATISFACTION SURVEY

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

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

	4 – Exceeded expectations	The platform was safe and the flight 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 in flight.
	3 – Met expectations	The platform 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 in flight.
	2 – Did not meet expectations	The platform had minor issues that could potentially have compromised safety or security and/or the flight 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 flight 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 aircraft.