

Chief Scientist: None: Pis: Macphee, Kirschvink, Ward, Barbeau	Ph:	MPC: Baker (Owen Cruise Coordinator)
Event #(s): G-170-E, G-436-E, G-432-E	E-mail: see RSPs	Cruise #: LMG09-11

Required fields are highlighted in yellow. Click in the gray text box to enter comments.

Send completed outbrief form to marine.super@usap.gov

Planning Services	
Yes	SIP Process Met Expectations?
Comments: PIs voiced opinion that Human interaction is sorely lacking in this process. This cruise case in point; the timing should have been more closely reviewed for reality of accessing the areas of interest at this time of year. Also there was a lack of interaction with the NSF, probably due to three different NSF PMs through the life of the project. A project planning meeting with the cruise participants would have been useful.	
Yes	RSP helpful and timely?
Comments: [Redacted]	
Yes	POC Responsive?
Comments: [Redacted]	

Medical Services	
Yes	Kits received on time?
Comments: Most participants liked the fact that forms are accessible electronically.	
No	Questions answered?
Comments: All PIs felt that there was a lack of responsiveness on the part of Medical. One 'for instance' was confusion over who paid for lab tests; one project had tests paid for and others did not. It would be helpful for the PI to be informed (as well as the project participant) when a field team member was PQd. Emails were sometimes not answered. There was confusion about the flu shot requirement. This needs to be more specific.	

Travel Services	
Yes	TRW available and understandable?
Comments: Generally okay; in some cases participants received forms and questions that did not pertain to the peninsula (ChCH hotels, etc.).	

Yes	Ticketing completed easily?
Comments: Copies of itineraries were not consistently received with the mailing that included luggage tags, etc. There was some confusion with the Barbeau project in that there was/is funded work on both 'sides' i.e. Antarctica and South America. As the SA field work is to take place after the Antarctic deployment, some travel requests were denied (initially) as 'personal travel' when in fact the personnel went into the field after returning on the LMG.	
Yes	Meet and assist service met requirements?
Comments: Excellent support, both in Santiago and Punta Arenas.	

Environmental Services

	Sample permits received okay?
Comments: N/A	
	ACA permits received okay?
Comments: N/A	
	Waste handling needs met?
Comments: N/A	

Equipment Availability

Yes	Requested equipment available?
Comments: Apparently equipment inventories were somewhat depleted due to other project demands, but all requested equipment was available.	
Yes	Damaged?
Comments: see ECW comments.	
No	Late?
Comments: █	
No	ECW gear in good condition?
Comments: ECW is not adequate for field work such as this. Some clothing is on the edge of being worn out. Alternate methods of supplying adequate field clothing should be explored; such as a 'clothing allowance' or supplies of better quality gear.	

Equipment Availability	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Lab space adequate?
Comments: [REDACTED]	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Remote sensing support needs met? (TeraScan, RadarSat)
Comments: Satellite imagery should be available prior to cruise (time period unspecified, perhaps one month) for 'reality check'.	

Hotel Services	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Cabins clean and neat?
Comments: Water in sinks frequently discolored due to rusty pipes.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Linens clean and in good condition?
Comments: [REDACTED]	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Food quality and variety was good?
Comments: [REDACTED]	

Research Objectives	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	All accomplished? If not, please explain (weather, ice, equipment, personnel, etc.)
Comments: Weather and ice conditions hampered and/or prevented landings and field camps in all primary work areas. Less than two total field days ashore.	

Future Cruises	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	If returning for another cruise, are there any additional equipment or support needs your group anticipates?
Comments: Mountaineering equipment; snowmobile, snow shoes or skis. A thorough analysis of alternate methodologies for landing field teams/camps when zodiac landings are not possible; i.e. crossing sea ice or across glaciers or icefields.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Anything you would like to see changed?
Comments: This time period was too early for the type of work anticipated. Work of this nature requires scheduling later in the austral summer when sea and fast ice and snowcover can be expected to be at their minimums.-	

Personnel Issues/Concerns

No	ECO
Comments: Open, friendly, approachable and forthright. Like the open bridge policy; good for morale.	
No	RPSC
Comments: Appreciated experience level of support personnel.	

Other Issues

Yes	Diving, Zodiac, E-mail support, interaction with stations, etc.?
Comments: Connectivity to the network for macintosh computers poor. Mac laptops could not 'see' the network drives. VGA adaptors to plug laptops into lounge LCD TV needed. The size restrictions on email attachments should be removed or increased for PIs- the argument in this case being that with fast changing locations being considered, the ability to get scientific papers forwarded to the ship is greatly hampered. Also, the post-cruise surveys that PIs are requested to fill out and return directly to addresses off the ship are too big and bounce back to sender.	