REFER TO: CB	DATE MAY 2 4 1977	INITIATOR CB/JPKerwin:lmc:5/24/77:2421	ENCL
TO: ✓CB/W. E. Thornton CB/K. G. Henize		CC CA/E. F. Kranz CB/J. W. Young	
FROM: CB/J. P. Kerwin		SIGNATURE Joseph P. Kerwin	

SUBJ: Debriefing Outline, SMD III/ASSESS II

This outline is suggested as a skeleton for your crew report. It contains the questions I think most need to be answered. It's pretty general. Please feel free to rearrange or add to it to suit your needs.

I. Training

    A. Amount of time devoted: Was it adequate? Was it correctly estimated? How early should MS and PS's be assigned to a payload?

    B. Usefulness of initial briefings; of task training, of phase training; of simulation.

    C. Adequacy of equipment used for training. Can flight hardware be used for training as well as integration?

    D. Where should training be conducted?

    E. Was there feedback to the crew as to their performance? Were valid data obtained?

    F. How was division of duties between MS and PS's devised? How much cross training was accomplished, and how much is desirable?

    G. Was there adequate training in Orbiter and Spacelab systems and procedures?

II. Procedures and Checklists

    A. Procedures development. As between PI's, NASA science team, crew, NASA flight operations team:

        1. Who developed initial and final procedures?

        2. Who wrote checklists?

        3. Who should do these things?

B. Were checklists adequate? Were sufficient schematics, malfunction procedures, etc., available?

III. Flight Planning

A. Was the integrated flight plan feasible? Too crowded? Sufficiently flexible?

B. Were there real-time deviations to the timeline? Were they initiated onboard or on the ground? Were they successful?

C. Would more Orbiter type procedures have been useful? Would the presence of CDR/PLT have been useful?

D. Any recommendations as to team organization and responsibilities?

IV. Experiment Hardware

Discuss for each experiment the adequacy of the hardware for zero-G operations; its safety, reliability, reparability, and ability to produce the deserved data. Was hardware unnecessarily complex? Were onboard displays adequate to verify hardware performance? Were there procedural "traps" resulting in improper operation or change to equipment? In what cases should onboard repair be planned for and attempted?

V. Operational Hardware (Orbiter, Spacelab, CORE)

Same questions as IV above.

VI. Animal Handling

Special comments and recommendations.

VII. Air-to-Ground Communications

A. Was PI-to-crew communications useful? Was it efficient?

B. Comment on the usefulness and proper procedures/constraints for

1. Teleprinter/typewritten messages to the spacecraft.

2. Private conversations between crew and physicians or others.

3. Television.

C. Other comments on test conduct.

VIII. Miscellaneous

IX. Conclusions and Recommendations