

901012 Imaging AUV

Rating: 2

MT contact: Doug

Management Team Feedback*General Comments:*

We are pleased to see the BIAUV transferred to operations and available for science in 2010. Excellent progress on the BIAUV in 2009. The Management team would like to see this asset used by operations before significant new capabilities are added. It is difficult for operations to operate a vehicle for research and have engineering perform engineering modifications to the vehicle at the same time due to differing criteria for success.

For Phase 2 please address the following:

- Schedule BIAUV Image processing / Metadata work first.
- Schedule BIAUV physical improvements in the second half of the year to allow some operations with the existing capabilities in the first half of the year. This will also help avoid resource conflicts with other projects.
- Propose development of midwater capabilities IAUV in 2011 after a requirements review that addresses midwater imaging requirements (including assessment of alternative imaging approaches) and after a careful evaluation of the effectiveness of incorporating thrusters to the AUV for maneuvering compared to the effectiveness of providing additional control surfaces
- For terrain following software please clarify the agreement between MBARI and the external collaborator (Horner)
- The Budget Entry system will reopen this week. Please correct the labor requests to:
 - o ME: 936 hours
 - o SE: 1269 hours
 - o EE: 405 hours
- Remove contextual sensors for midwater module from 2010 budget.
- Remove the support cost of MARS EK60 from 2010 budget.

Type of Project	Score	Comments
	(A,B,C,D,F)	
Criteria for All Projects		
Importance: Does the project address an important problem in oceanographic research?	A	
Uniqueness: How unique is this contribution?	A	
MBARI: Is this project well-suited for undertaking at MBARI?	A	
Timeliness: Why should this project move forward now? What are the drivers?	A/C	Benthic/Midwater
Strategic Plan: Does the project demonstrate relevance to MBARI's strategic plan?	A	
The Team: Is the team appropriate for the work?	A	
The Team: Is the team available, and are they committed to this project?	A/C	Committed/Not available early in the year
Prior Productivity: Has the project leadership been successful with prior support on this project?	N/A	
Development Projects		
Does the project have strong backing of, and involvement from, both Science and Engineering?	A	
Is the plan for project management suitable for the size of the effort and complexity being proposed?	A	
How adequate is the project plan (technical approach, WBS, schedule, risk mitigation plan, schedule of design reviews)?	C	Aggressive Schedule
Does the proposal demonstrate a good understanding of the prior art and foundation technologies?	A	
How effective is the project in leveraging off existing capabilities (rather than reinventing the wheel)?	A	
Is there a clear and realistic set of functional requirements or is there a method suggested to derive user requirements?	A/C	Benthic/Midwater
Has a cost benefit analysis been performed or is one planned to be performed as part of this proposal?	A	
Does this proposal demonstrate cost consciousness and clear budget justification?	A	
Are requests for shared MBARI resources (ship time, personnel, etc.) well explained and justified?	A	Clarify and Cross reference ship requests
Does the project have a transition plan, especially to the larger community?	C	No Plan for external transition.