

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. James Cook	Cruise ID:	JC130	Dates:	
PS name:	Carol Cotterill/Dave Smith	Institute & position:	NERC BGS EPM / Operations Manager	Email:	cicott@bgs.ac.uk dism@bgs.ac.uk
Work type:	IODP seabed drill Expedition	Area of operation:	Atlantis Massif, mid Atlantic Ridge		
Master:	John Leask	Tech Liaison Officer:	Andrew Moore		

		Please tick the appropriate box and add comments if required						
		Exceeded	Met	Below	Greatly Below	Comments	Complaint filed (Y/N)	Internal Use Only: Logged
	Supply Agreement Requirements							
	Science Objectives Met					Two transects were planned – one with five sites running E-W and one with four sites running N-S. The aims and objectives were met for the E-W transect, although no hole reached target depth. Unfortunately the objectives were not met for the N-S transect. The main reason behind both the shallower depths E-W and not reaching many of the N-S sites were due to technical problems with both seabed rock drills combined with weather downtime reducing operational capability. The seabed drills used on this project were themselves new to the IODP programme, and they carried many new technological developments that had not been tried out before – all of these technological additions were successful, and included bespoke logging tools, water sensor packages, flushed CTD bottles and tracer injection to determine possible contamination of microbiology samples. In addition a number of CTD casts were conducted, expanding on the original programme of		

					water sampling. Interesting results are already being seen. The multibeam map acquired predominantly during weather downtime was very good, with additional science research now being able to be undertaken based on this.																	
	Downtime			x	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Downtime</td> <td></td> <td>Reason</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ship</td> <td>80 hours</td> <td>1. Provided incorrect transit time during planning stage 2. Transit to site took longer due to adverse weather</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equipment</td> <td>2 x Seabed Rockdrills</td> <td>User supplied technical breakdowns</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weather</td> <td>112 hours</td> <td>Onsite</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Downtime		Reason	Ship	80 hours	1. Provided incorrect transit time during planning stage 2. Transit to site took longer due to adverse weather	Equipment	2 x Seabed Rockdrills	User supplied technical breakdowns	Weather	112 hours	Onsite	Other				
Downtime		Reason																				
Ship	80 hours	1. Provided incorrect transit time during planning stage 2. Transit to site took longer due to adverse weather																				
Equipment	2 x Seabed Rockdrills	User supplied technical breakdowns																				
Weather	112 hours	Onsite																				
Other																						
	Safety instructions If Accidents or Near misses have been filed refer to these.			X	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Accidents</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>JCPAR 07-16 Submitted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Near Miss</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>JCNMR 07-15 Submitted</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>JCNMR 08-15 Submitted</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MAIB</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Accidents			JCPAR 07-16 Submitted	Near Miss			JCNMR 07-15 Submitted		JCNMR 08-15 Submitted	MAIB						
Accidents																						
	JCPAR 07-16 Submitted																					
Near Miss																						
	JCNMR 07-15 Submitted																					
	JCNMR 08-15 Submitted																					
MAIB																						
Pre-Cruise	Programming & SME				????????????????																	
	Pre-Cruise Planning / Supply agreement			X	Difficult to pin down the cruise date in the lead up to this expedition, which had an impact on planning this large international project																	
	Pre Cruise Planning & Communications			X	After the cruise dates had been provided, very good planning took place and operational issues identified by both sides were dealt with in a timely and professional manner. There was some confusion over the required medical certificates and sea survival courses undertaken by those based abroad, with them not being able to take the UK specified ones. However, this was resolved once identified.																	
	Mobilisation Support			X	Excellent support by Jez Evans and his team, who managed a complex mobilisation extremely well, despite many factors thrown at him, mainly from the NMF side. He went the extra mile on numerous occasions. This buffer and interface made the mobilisation extremely smooth from the 'client' perspective.																	
Onboard Support	Communications			X	Good communications were quickly established, with all crew being very open, clear and concise in their communications.																	
	Staff			X	Extremely helpful during the operation, every request and concern was investigated and addressed. The officers and crew were proactive in investigating issues and wanting to make things better rather than dismissing issues, this included H&S with some interesting scenarios devised. The ability for the technical support (Andrew Moore) to multitask with all the ship board equipment was excellent and provided added value to this expedition.																	

					The catering staff were very thorough when preparing food for those with dietary restrictions, and there were many comments about how accommodating they had been.		
	<u>Scientific Facilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Functionality ▪ Performance ▪ Reliability ▪ Safety ▪ Cleanliness of labs 		X		<p>A deep clean of labs had been requested prior to this cruise, which had been carried out. There were some intermittent problems with maintaining the correct temperature in the CE lab, with fluctuations both up and down. However, once informed, the engineers were very quick in responding to this, and temporarily resolving it.</p> <p>Persistent sewage smells in various labs were initially dismissed, but later investigated and found to be an underlying and persistent problem, (which also led to leaking into one science cabin). Although this could not be fixed during this cruise, measures were put in place to stop these smells.</p> <p>A new gas alarm in the labs was initially thought to be operating correctly, but later found certain functions were not in fact working, giving a false sense of security.</p> <p>DP, CTD and multibeam equipment provided all functioned well.</p>		
	<u>Domestic Facilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hotel facilities ▪ Catering service ▪ Cleanliness of ship 		X		<p>Some cabins were less than clean, which was disappointing considering the previous crew had been alongside for most of their deployment.</p> <p>Generally the vessel was in a clean condition and attention was made to hygiene.</p> <p>Some toilets had difficulty in flushing, which was persistent. Provision needs to be made for the disposal of female sanitary items – after asking for two weeks, this was still not forthcoming in some bathrooms.</p> <p>One cabin was particularly noisy and very difficult to sleep in. The previous crew had dismissed this. The JC130 engineers investigated and found what had been a persistent problem. Although nothing could be done about fixing the underlying problem during the cruise, they did switch off certain AC functions at night so that the noise from this broken valve was stopped for these periods.</p> <p>Food excellent, probably the best on any research ship. Catering for a variety of diets showed knowledge, diligence and an excellent variety of foods.</p>		
	<u>Demobilisation Support</u> Please advise on any issues post completion	X			Not carried out during this reporting period, but suspect it will be excellent		
	Any Other Business						

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?