

NERC Cruise Assessment/ Debrief Agenda Form

This form is an important tool in enabling NERC to monitor the performance of its marine facilities providers, as well as providing useful feedback for improving service provision. Consequently, NERC requires all PS's who are programmed in its Marine Facilities Programme (including cruises on barter ships) to complete this form. Please see attached guidance notes for details on how this form should be completed and subsequently handled.

All forms are reviewed by NERC's Cruise Programme Review Group (CPRG) and therefore subsequently become part of the public record. Therefore, please do NOT make reference to individuals by name; any feedback on individuals (both positive and negative) should be sent direct to the head of the appropriate service (Please see guidance notes for contact details).

Ship :	R.R.S. Discovery	Cruise ID:	DY061	Dates:	28/10/16 – 08/11/16
PS name:	Andy Henson	Institute & position:	NMF Head of SE	Email:	andhen@noc.ac.uk
Work type:	Seismic SVP		Area of operation:	Canary Basin	
Master:	Antonio Gatti		Tech Liaison Officer:	J Scott	

Post Cruise Assessment Meeting

Sunday 6th November 2016

10:30 Conference Room

Present: **A. Gatti (Master), A. Lewtas (Cheng), E. Voaden (Choff), I Watterson(Purser),A.Henson (SEM), S. Scott (EMOEG), L. Wedge (CM)**

		Please tick the appropriate box and add comments if required						
	Supply Agreement Requirements	Exceeded	Met	Below	Greatly Below	Comments	Complaint filed (Y/N)	Internal Use Only: Logged

	Science Objectives Met		√																					
	Downtime		√			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Downtime</th> <th>Nil</th> <th>Reason</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Ship</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equipment</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weather</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Downtime	Nil	Reason	Ship			Equipment			Weather			Other					
Downtime	Nil	Reason																						
Ship																								
Equipment																								
Weather																								
Other																								
	Safety instructions If Accidents or Near misses have been filed refer to these.		√			<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Accidents</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NONE</td> <td>x</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Near Miss</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAIB</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Accidents		NONE	x	Near Miss				MAIB									
Accidents																								
NONE	x																							
Near Miss																								
MAIB																								
Pre-Cruise	Programming & SME		√			This was an internally commissioned NMF SVP, the PI being a senior manager in NMF.																		
	Pre-Cruise Planning / Supply agreement		√			N/A																		
	Pre Cruise Planning & Communications		√																					
	Mobilisation Support		√																					
Onboard Support	Communications		√			A full briefing prior to commencing work meant that all on board were aware of the aims of the expedition and what their part in it was. A constant dialogue was maintained between ship and technical party.																		
	Staff		√			Support from the deck department in particular was excellent. There was some reservation prior to the expedition that enough technicians were carried to meet the aims of the SVP. The enthusiasm and engagement of the deck department was far greater than I have witnessed previously on a seismics expedition. The Chief Engineer has been especially helpful.																		
	Scientific Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Functionality ▪ Performance ▪ Reliability ▪ Safety ▪ Cleanliness of labs 		√			The lack of an E-Stop for deck hydraulics has been mentioned elsewhere and actioned. A full defect list will be in the PI's technical report. During commissioning it was discovered that the fisher Vv assembly was missing some vital parts and had never been tested after build. The Chief Engineer engaged fully with the problem and when attempts to source the required parts failed built a pressure control switch which was tested on the transit to Tenerife but found to have shortcomings. The CEng and EMOEG removed the controller from James Cook and fitted it in Tenerife.																		
	Domestic Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hotel facilities ▪ Catering service ▪ Cleanliness of ship 		√			Food has been consistently good and hotel services beyond reproach.																		
	Demobilisation Support Please advise on any		√																					

	issues post completion							
	Any Other Business		√			Finding defects and shortcomings from build when the ship is 3 years old highlights the need for verification periods of this nature.		

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR COMPLETING THE ASSESSMENT FORM

For cruises on NMF Sea Systems vessels it is requested that this form is completed prior to the on board Cruise Debrief Meeting (see agenda in 3205.2) and so that any issues raised can be addressed at this meeting. Following this the original form (unaltered) will be sent by the Master to the Head of NMF-SS at NOC so that any outstanding issues can be addressed by NMF-SS shore staff. You will be advised of any further responses by letter, but all issues raised during NMF cruises are recorded and follow up action detailed on the NMF-SS website: this can be accessed at <http://www.noc.soton.ac.uk/nmf/mfp/mfp.php>

For cruises on Barter vessels the form should be sent to the Head of NMF Sea Systems, Leigh Storey, leigh.storey@noc.ac.uk
When the cruise has also utilised NMF facilities (including NMEP items), the form will be dealt with as detailed above for NMF-SS ships; for other cruises the form will be forwarded direct to NERC.

All forms will be sent to the NERC Marine Planning Office for information, and will be included with the papers provided to the next meeting of the Cruise Programme Review Group. Occasionally when a PS raises issues of a very serious nature, they will be invited to make either a personal or written submission to the group to provide fuller details.

When completing the form, please use the following bullet points to help you in your assessment of whether the service provided met your cruise needs, although it is requested that you attach more weight to any issue that has impacted on your cruise objectives. **NOTE: Columns which are found to be unassessed will be marked as Met Supply Agreement Requirements.**

Please feel free to make suggestions for service provision improvement in any section.

1) Science objectives met

- a) Were the objectives specified in the Supply Agreement completed?
- b) Were services supplied in accordance with the Supply Agreement (please amplify in the appropriate section)?

2) Downtime

The Master will provide you with a detailed breakdown of cruise time including downtime with the post cruise timetable, but was there any 'loss' of science time during the cruise which you consider unreasonable?

3) Safety

Please ensure that any Accident or Near-miss Reports filed are cross-referenced in this section

- a) Was the pre-cruise safety information provided satisfactory?
- b) Were the on board safety briefings and drills adequate?
- c) If there were any accidents/near misses, do you think the investigation/reporting system was effective?

4) Programming & SME

- a) Did you attend a PI Workshop and was this helpful to you?
- b) Were respective responsibilities in the planning process clearly outlined to you?
- c) Did you find the Marine Facilities Planning website helpful?
- d) Did you receive appropriate advice/support in the compilation of your SME Form?
- e) Did NMF-SS and NERC Marine Planning deal with any programming issues to your satisfaction?

5) Pre-Cruise Planning & Communications

- a) (For NMF-SS cruises) Did your assigned cruise manager establish good communications with you?
- b) Were you provided with all necessary information required to plan your cruise?
- c) Were any late changes to the ships programme dealt with appropriately and communicated to you in good time?

6) Pre-Cruise Planning / Supply Agreement

- a) Was the Supply Agreement completed in reasonable time prior the cruise?
- b) Was the planning meeting attended by all appropriate staff?
- c) Did the planning meeting discuss all your requirements in sufficient detail and to your satisfaction?

7) Mobilisation support

- a) Did all equipment arrive as planned?
- b) Was ship set up as required (bench set ups, container locations etc)?
- c) Was the mobilisation completed in the planned timescale?
- d) Was any scientific equipment damaged during mob?

8) Onboard communications

- a) Were you clear about respective roles and responsibilities of Master, PS and TLO?
- b) Were you kept informed by the STO and Master of any changing circumstances that affected the progress of your cruise?
- c) Did the interface between science team and onboard staff (including cruise progress meetings, dialogue between PS, Master, and STO etc.) work to your satisfaction?
- d) Were any issues that required the attention of shore support staff effectively communicated and in an appropriate timescale?
- e) Were you properly briefed by onboard staff on operational, domestic and safety procedures?

9) Onboard support - staff

- a) Were onboard staff competent and appropriately trained to support your cruise?
- b) Were there sufficient technicians and (if appropriate) extra deck staff assigned to your cruise?
- c) Were onboard staff helpful, friendly and flexible in response to your needs?
- d) Were onboard staff fully engaged in the aims of your cruise?

10) Onboard support - scientific facilities

- a) Did equipment work as specified?
- b) Was equipment supplied suitable for the cruise?
- c) Were there any breakdowns of equipment?
- d) Were there any safety problems with any equipment?
- e) Were sufficient consumables and spares supplied for your cruise?

11) Onboard support - domestic arrangements

- a) Were facilities provided in cabins and (where appropriate) shared bathroom facilities, suitable?
- b) Were meals of an acceptable standard and variety, and were timings suitable for your work?
- c) Was duty mess out-of-hours provision suitable?

- d) Were laundry facilities suitable?
- e) Were leisure facilities suitable?
- f) Was the cleanliness of the vessel, both internally and externally, acceptable?

12) Arrangements for Demobilisation support

- a) Have you made any requests for special requirements (dry ice, hazmat etc.)?
- b) Have return equipment lists been completed?