

**BY ORDER OF THE  
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE**

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2EC-130H,  
VOLUME 2**



**28 NOVEMBER 2012**

*Incorporating Change 1, 6 AUGUST 2014*

***Intelligence***

***EC-130H UNIT INTELLIGENCE  
EVALUATION CRITERIA***

**COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY**

---

**ACCESSIBILITY:** Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing website at [www.e-publishing.af.mil](http://www.e-publishing.af.mil).

**RELEASABILITY:** There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

---

OPR: ACC/A2

Certified by: AF/A2D  
(Brig Gen Donald J. Bacon)

Pages: 23

---

This publication implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, and is consistent with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, and AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*. This publication establishes the minimum Air Force standards for training personnel performing intelligence duties in EC-130H units. This publication applies to Regular Air Force (RegAF), Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting EC-130H operations. The National Guard Bureau will be considered functionally as a major command (MAJCOM) for the purposes of this publication. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located in the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS). This AFI may be supplemented, but all supplements must be coordinated with the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended changes to the OPR using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. Route AF Forms 847 through the appropriate functional chain of command. The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3") number following the compliance statement. See AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate tier waiver approval authority, or alternately, to the publication OPR for non-tiered compliance items.

***SUMMARY OF CHANGES***

This interim change adds risk factors, known as “tiers” to tasks assigned to organizations below major command (MAJCOM) level to depict the assessed risk of non-compliance. A margin bar (|) indicates newly revised material.

<b>Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1. General. ....	3
1.2. Procedures. ....	3
1.3. Evaluation Instructions. ....	4
1.4. Additional Training. ....	4
1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance. ....	4
<b>Chapter 2—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. General. ....	5
Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations - Operations Intelligence. ....	5
Table 2.2. Intelligence Evaluations - Compass Call Analysis and Targeting Team (CCATT). .....	6
2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation. ....	6
2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations. ....	9
<b>Chapter 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1. General Evaluation Standards. ....	10
3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. ....	10
Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. ....	10
3.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria. ....	17
Table 3.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria. ....	17
Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria. ....	20
<b>Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION</b>	<b>21</b>

## Chapter 1

### GENERAL INFORMATION

**1.1. General.** This volume provides intelligence evaluators (IE) and examinees with procedures and evaluation criteria to be used during knowledge and task phases of initial and periodic evaluations. All evaluations will be conducted IAW the provisions of AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, and this publication.

1.1.1. Objective. The examinee must satisfactorily demonstrate the ability to perform required duties safely and effectively, IAW applicable instructions and directives.

1.1.2. Waivers. ACC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of significant trends in waiver correspondence if such correspondence indicates the need to readdress existing policy and guidance.

1.1.3. Supplements. AF/A2 delegates approval authority to the MAJCOM/A2 for MAJCOM authored supplements to this AFI. MAJCOMs will ensure copies are provided to AF/A2, ACC/A2 and all appropriate MAJCOMs upon publication. Per AFPD 14-2, supplements will not be less restrictive than the lead AFI and should be limited to unique requirements only.

1.1.4. Changes. Send recommended changes to this publication on AF Form 847, through appropriate channels to ACC/A2.

### 1.2. Procedures.

1.2.1. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified IE, the examinee must have successfully completed (verified by applicable AF Forms 4381) all duty position required Mission Qualification Training or Specialized Training requirements outlined in AFI 14-2EC-130H, Volume 1, *EC-130H Unit Intelligence Training*. (T-2)

1.2.2. IEs will use the evaluation criteria contained in Chapter 3 for conducting all intelligence evaluations. To ensure standard and objective evaluations, IEs will be thoroughly familiar with the prescribed evaluation criteria. (T-2)

1.2.3. Prior to commencing an evaluation, the IE will brief the examinee on the conduct, purpose, requirements and applicable criteria of the evaluation. The examinee will accomplish required planning IAW the task being evaluated. (T-3)

1.2.4. Conduct and document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing or post-mission aircrew debrief) to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to conduct an evaluation in a realistic environment, evaluations may be conducted via an alternate method (i.e., simulated, staged, or by verbal examination) in order to complete the evaluation. Document the reasons and type of alternate method used in the Comments section of the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*. (T-2)

1.2.5. The IE will thoroughly debrief all aspects of the evaluation. This debrief will include the examinee's overall rating, specific deviations, area grades assigned (if other than qualified) and any required additional training. (T-3)

**1.3. Evaluation Instructions.** Standards and performance parameters are contained in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, and this publication. The IE will compare examinee performance for each area accomplished during the evaluation with the evaluation criteria provided in this volume and assign an appropriate evaluation grade for the area. Use the general area/sub-area grades in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 5. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level (also found in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 5). (T-3)

1.3.1. AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, used by the trainer in documenting training will be used to assist the IE in determining the overall qualification and for documenting AF Form 4350. (T-3)

1.3.2. IE judgment must be exercised when the wording for general evaluated areas is subjective and when specific situations are not covered. (T-3)

**1.4. Additional Training.** IEs are responsible for recommending additional training at their discretion. Document any additional training and completion IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-3)

**1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance.** Examinees receiving an overall qualification level 3 (Q-3) will be placed in supervised status until recommended additional training is completed and/or a reevaluation is successfully accomplished. If an examinee receives a Q-3 on a mission evaluation (INIT MSN or MSN), they will not perform mission duties unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. If an examinee receives a Q-3 on a specialized evaluation, they will not perform specialized duties until remedial actions are accomplished, but they can perform basic mission duties unless specifically restricted. (T-2)

## Chapter 2

## EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

**2.1. General.** The intelligence evaluation must include all areas listed in this chapter as they relate to the examinee's duty position and as depicted in Tables 2.1, *Intelligence Evaluations - Operations Intelligence* and/or Table 2.2, *Intelligence Evaluations - Compass Call Analysis and Targeting Team (CCATT)*. (T-2)

**Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations - Operations Intelligence.**

TITLE	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE
Knowledge Evaluations				
EC-130H Weapon System	R	R	----	----
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	R	R	----	----
Personnel Recovery	R	R	----	----
Force Protection Intelligence	R	R	----	----
Performance Task Evaluations				
Threat Briefings	R	R	----	----
Requests for Information	R	R	----	----
Situation Displays	R	R	----	----
Manual Order of Battle (OB)	R	R	----	----
Automated OB	R	R	----	----
Initial Situation Briefing	R	R	----	----
Situation Briefing	R	R	----	----
Changeover Briefing	R	R	----	----
Deployment Briefing	R	R	----	----
Air Tasking Order (ATO)/Air Control Order (ACO)/Special Instructions (SPINS)/Reconnaissance, Surveillance & Targeting Acquisition (RSTA) Annex	R	R	----	----
Intelligence Support to MPC	R	R	----	----
Mission Briefing	R	R	----	----
Step Briefing	R	R	----	----
Mission Tracking	R	R	----	----
Mission Debriefing	R	R	----	----
Intelligence Reports	R	R	----	----
Specialized Task Evaluations				
Instructional Ability	----	----	R	----
Evaluator Ability	----	----	----	R
<b>Note:</b> Gradesheet templates for each area are included in AFI14-2EC-130H, Volume 1. Passing criteria for any knowledge evaluation is 85% of answers correct.				
R = Required area of evaluation				

INIT MSN = Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation MSN = Mission Qualification Evaluation EIT = External Intelligence Trainer Qualification Evaluation IE = Intelligence Evaluator Qualification Evaluation
---

**Table 2.2. Intelligence Evaluations - Compass Call Analysis and Targeting Team (CCATT).**

Knowledge Evaluations				
CCATT Research Methods and Databases	R	R		
Performance Task Evaluations				
CCATT Request for Information (RFI) Response	R	R		
CCATT Intelligence Reporting	R	R		
Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Reporting Analysis	R	R		
Signals of Interest (SOI)	R	R		
C3 Diagrams	R	R		
C3 Target Nomination List	R	R		
C3 Analysis Briefing	R	R		
CCATT Mission Crew Debriefing	R	R		
Instructional Ability			R	
Evaluator Ability				R
<p><b>Note:</b> Gradesheet templates for each area are included in AFI14-2EC-130H, Volume 1. Passing criteria for any knowledge evaluation is 85% of answers correct.</p> <p>R = Required area of evaluation          INIT MSN = Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation          MSN = Mission Qualification Evaluation          EIT = External Intelligence Trainer Qualification Evaluation          IE = Intelligence Evaluator Qualification Evaluation</p>				

## 2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluation. Knowledge evaluations will be conducted as part of the initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's understanding of EC-130H systems academics, threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapons systems, visual recognition (VR), Personnel Recovery (PR), Force Protection Intelligence (FPI), and CCATT research methods and databases. Examinees will complete a knowledge test from the unit's master question file (MQF) for mission qualification evaluation subject areas. Examinees will take a separate VR test. Both examinations will be recorded on the AF Form 4350 IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Knowledge examinations may also be required during specialized qualification evaluations. Basic Intelligence Research, Analysis and Dissemination (RAD) and Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment (IPOE) involve knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of the evaluation and will be evaluated as subsets of each applicable graded area. (T-2)

2.2.2. Performance Task Evaluation. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based on current intelligence, unit tasking and area of responsibility (AOR) scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management principles to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. The following guidelines are provided to assist in constructing evaluation materials: (T-2)

2.2.2.1. RFIs. Actual contingency or exercise materials may be used. Evaluate the examinee's ability to draft an RFI to forward to outside organization. Consider ability to provide clear questions, sources checked, realistic latest time intelligence of value, product type desired, dissemination method as well as additional items IAW local checklists.

2.2.2.2. Situation displays. The situation for which the display is being built should contain enough data for the examinee to make decisions on the best medium to use for the creating the display. Include a large variety of items from AFI 14-2(MDS), Volume 3 that will challenge the examinee to conduct research and analysis to determine the relevance of the data to the situation. The number of items to be plotted should be of sufficient volume to be challenging, yet not so overwhelming that the time taken is beyond that necessary to determine proficiency. The exercise will include both geographic coordinates and Military Grid Reference System (MGRS) coordinates. Evaluate the examinee's ability to convert coordinates between geographic coordinates (DD/MM/SS) and MGRS (NNAAAXXXXXX); and also from geographic coordinates to decimal minutes (DD/MM.mm). The scenario may include erroneous information to mirror the fog of war by including intentionally incorrect coordinates or types of threats for the particular AOR, thereby allowing the IE to assess the examinee's ability to identify errors and question the validity of information. The examinee should use MIL-STD-2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbolism* and US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, FM 1-02, *Operational Terms and Graphics*.

2.2.2.2.1. Manual OB. The number of OB items in the plotting exercise will be sufficient to have a variety of threats to plot to ensure correct symbology is used. The examinee must be able to identify critical elements of the table of organization and equipment for the OB being used.

2.2.2.2.2. Automated Order of Battle. Examinee should be provided with a variety of OB sources from which to pull data. Evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and save threat files, insert accurate data, update and purge data to ensure quality control of the displayed data and question the accuracy of the information for a particular AOR.

2.2.2.3. Intelligence Briefings. The examinee should assemble briefings from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, and imagery. Evaluated briefings include: initial situation briefing, situation briefing deployment briefing, mission briefing, step briefing, threat briefings and changeover briefing.

2.2.2.4. ATO, ACO, SPINS, RSTA Annex and other tasking documents. Scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials may be used for this purpose. Provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit tasked on the ATO. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in identifying and breaking out

elements of ATO/ACO/SPINS/RSTA Annex. Include unit tasking, supported missions, air space control, personnel recovery SPINS, and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) platform tasking.

2.2.2.5. Intelligence support to the Mission Planning Cell (MPC). Actual contingency planning or exercise materials and imagery may be used. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency analyzing threats along ingress/egress routes and mission orbits, briefing route planners, providing intelligence support and aiding in mission package construction. Include threats that impact mission routing in order to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in recognizing the threat and passing recommendations to the MPC.

2.2.2.6. Mission Tracking. Use scenario or actual exercise to allow examinee to flight follow missions in execution. Ensure opportunity exists to evaluate examinee's proficiency to keep abreast of ongoing missions and upcoming debriefs. Examine debrief forms to see that information has been filled in to maximum extent prior to engine shut down. Present simulated situation where aircraft is diverted. Ensure systems are used if available to aid examinee in monitoring progress of fraged missions.

2.2.2.7. Debriefing. Conduct aircrew debriefings following actual flying missions whenever possible. The evaluator may construct inject cards or coordinate with aircrew to identify a particular threat scenario for the debriefing. Ensure there is enough activity to represent the typical level of detail for a threat scenario commensurate with unit AOR tasking. Grade the examinee's ability to control the debriefing, ask amplifying questions and recognize relevant information.

2.2.2.8. Intelligence Reports. Construct mission reports (MISREPs) and intelligence reports (INTREPs) using information provided in aircrew debriefings. Reports should be completed IAW MAJCOM/theater/combatant command intelligence reporting directives.

2.2.2.9. CCATT Intelligence Reporting. Examinee will construct a post mission report using information provided in aircrew debriefings and from mission logs. Evaluation should ensure reports are completed and disseminated IAW local checklists.

2.2.2.10. SIGINT Reporting Analysis. Examinee should be provided a target set in order to research and analyze SIGINT relevant to COMPASS CALL operations. Examinee should have access to real-world databases and systems used by CCATT daily and in contingency situations. Evaluator should ensure target set provided has reporting of sufficient volume and content to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in analyzing and extracting information. Examinee will be graded on ability to extract COMPASS CALL relevant data from available SIGINT reports.

2.2.2.11. Signals of Interest (SOI). Actual contingency planning or exercise materials may be used. Scenario should be of sufficient volume and detail to evaluate the examinee's proficiency analyzing communications nodes and determining potential targets. Scenario will not include Mission Crew Commander prioritization requirements. Evaluator should consider examinee's prioritization of target sets and frequencies in accordance with provided scenario.

2.2.2.12. Command, Control, and Communications (C3) Diagrams Analysis. Evaluator will provide examinee a target set in order to develop both physical and functional

diagrams portraying C3 links and nodes. Examinee should have access to all CCATT resources and target set should have reporting volume sufficient for examinee to construct the diagrams with limited questions. Examinee will be graded on ability to create correct physical and functional diagrams, including physical locations, connectivity methods and redundancy, and nodal criticality and vulnerability ratings.

2.2.2.13. C3 Target Nomination List (TNL). Examinee should be provided priority requirements as would be provided by the Mission Crew Commander during mission planning as well as materials from C3 Diagrams and SIGINT Reporting Analysis tasks and simulated mission objectives. Examinee should have access to all CCATT resources and previously developed targets and be able to develop the TNL with limited support. Grade examinee's ability to prioritize targets in accordance with provided mission objectives. Additionally consider prioritization changes recommended from examinee after analysis of the target set.

2.2.2.14. C3 Analysis Briefing. The examinee should assemble briefings from materials developed as part of the evaluation (C3 diagrams, SOI worksheet, TNL) or alternately, by requirements provided by the evaluator. Audience may include aircrew acting as member(s) of MPC in addition to evaluator acting in that capacity. Examinee will be graded on ability to present C3 Analysis Briefing IAW local checklist. Grade should also consider examinees ability to answer follow up questions.

### **2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.**

2.3.1. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. EIT trainer evaluations will consist of a knowledge examination and a task evaluation conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Only qualified EIT trainers may conduct unsupervised intelligence training. Upon completion of EIT trainer profiles, as outlined in AFI 14-2EC-130H, Volume 1, the EIT trainer will demonstrate knowledge of the information presented by successfully completing a test based on the questions from the MQF (85 percent minimum to pass), as applicable. The EIT trainer will also be evaluated on their ability to present training in each applicable profile. Evaluators will give the examinee no less than four hours notice of the subject matter or briefing topic for the evaluation. (T-3)

2.3.1.1. In certain circumstances it may be beneficial to qualify an individual to conduct training in more than one individual EIT event at a time. The individual must complete the specific training identified for the event and be evaluated on the task or briefing element by an IE. The individual must maintain currency and be reevaluated periodically for the subject matter according to AFI 14-2EC-130H, Volume 1. (T-2)

2.3.1.2. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. All applicable EIT and MSN areas must be evaluated.

2.3.2. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation. IE evaluations will consist of a performance task evaluation and conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. All applicable IE and MSN areas must be evaluated. (T-3)

## Chapter 3

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

**3.1. General Evaluation Standards.** The evaluation criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: Mission Qualification Training and Specialized Training evaluation Criteria. Use all sections of criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation. (T-2)

**3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.** The evaluation criteria in Table 3.1 applies to tasks associated with the duty positions in which personnel maintain mission qualifications.

**Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.**

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answers at least 85% of questions in closed-book test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable.
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
VISUAL RECOGNITION (VR)	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in VR test.
Q-	Not applicable.
U	Failed to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in VR test.
THREAT BRIEFINGS	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Clear understanding of research methods and sources and IPOE concepts. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Tailored threat briefing to the capabilities of the EC-130H airframe, avionics and countertactics. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced. Fielded questions correctly.
Q-	Presentation somewhat lacking in quality but all required areas were covered. Minor omissions, recovered when prompted. Some comparisons of threat to EC-130H, but not many. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Threat was not tailored to EC-130H capabilities. Major gaps in information, unable to recover with prompting. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Fabricated information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of EC-130H mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
RFIs	
Q	Exhausted all internal resources. Considered time requirements in developing written vs. verbal request to higher headquarters. Written request is clear and concise. Timeline for information value reasonable and carefully considered. Local and theater procedures adhered to. Proper classification on request.
Q-	Request somewhat disorganized and/or redundant. Requires minor assistance but recovers with little prompting.
U	Request unclear; does not identify information gap. Could have been satisfied with available resources. Did not follow established submission procedures.

	Improper classification.
<b>SITUATION DISPLAYS (Includes MANUAL and AUTOMATED OB)</b>	
Q	Correctly determined the proper medium, including type and scale, for creating the best situation display. Researched and analyzed data for accuracy, inconsistencies, and relevance to the situation. Used manual and automated processes to accurately plot all threats/items within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates. Consistently used correct symbology IAW MIL-STD-2525C, <i>Common Warfighting Symbology</i> and US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, FM 1-02, <i>Operational Terms and Graphics</i> . Correctly extracted geographic coordinates and MGRSs. Plotted to appropriate level of detail with respect to unit requirements. Successfully downloaded, printed, exported and displayed data. Able to manipulate data, display appropriate threat rings and perform terrain masking analysis. Demonstrated ability to convert various coordinate formats. Accurately maintained situation display to unit specifications, including classification and currency. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Did not select the best medium for creating the situation display. Did not fully research and analyze data resulting in some minor irrelevant items to be included. Plotted 95% of the data within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates, the remaining 5% within 1nm. Minor inconsistencies in symbology, corrected with little prompting. Needed little assistance with coordinate conversions.
U	Errors would have significantly impacted mission success. Unable to identify errors or inconsistencies in data. Unable to complete tasks without significant supervision or intervention. Incorrect classification.
<b>INITIAL SITUATION BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items, and well-tailored analysis relevant to audience. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources and IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Understood and provided detailed information tailored to the audience. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant.
U	Failed to use checklist. Content poorly organized, not tailored appropriately. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of IPOE concepts. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or

	the impact information may have. Negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
<b>SITUATION BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items since last update, and well- tailored analysis relevant to audience. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources and IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Quickly identified significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Content not tailored appropriately. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of IPOE concepts. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have. Negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
<b>CHANGEOVER BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Well planned, appropriate checklist usage, addressed relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls to pass on to next shift. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Quickly identified significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. Correctly annotated event log, identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Omitted no more than one key area/issue at changeover, was able to recover with prompting or minimal assistance. Errors due to extenuating circumstances (e.g. relocation, attacks, etc.) vs. poor planning.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Deficiencies not due to extenuating circumstances. Inability to recover even with minor prompting. Omissions would have affected next shift. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
<b>DEPLOYMENT BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Professionally delivered, well organized, clear. Effective use of checklist and

	followed local procedures. Tailored, relevant content. Easily understood by audience. Effective use of visual aids. Classification appropriate for audience. Identified key points including synopsis of military and political situation generating the deployment, and enemy activity and force disposition in AOR and along deployment route. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poorly organized, not tailored. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
<b>ATO/ACO/SPINS/RSTA ANNEX BREAKOUT</b>	
Q	Demonstrated ability to extract relevant information from the ATO/ACO/SPINS/RSTA Annex and any changes. Correctly extracted unit tasking, supported missions, ISR tasking, airspace control measures and other relevant information.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or adversely impact intelligence integration in mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed some assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have impacted intelligence integration in mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention.
<b>INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO MPC</b>	
Q	Exhibited a thorough understanding of mission tasking. Clear knowledge of threats in AOR and potential impact with respect to EC-130H capabilities and limitations. Demonstrated ability to relay information succinctly and provide recommendations to MPC.
Q-	Minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact mission planning. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Made errors or omissions that could have prevented an effective mission. Displayed faulty or limited knowledge of factors relevant to the mission. Improper use of mission planning tools or materials. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information.
<b>MISSION BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items IAW checklists: takeoff, enroute,

	track area and appropriate PR considerations. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources and IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Correctly annotated message traffic log, identified significant events and relayed Threat Update Codes. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced. Fielded questions correctly.
Q-	Presentation somewhat lacking in quality but all required areas were covered. Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Failed to use checklist. Very confusing or redundant. Major gaps in information, unable to recover even with prompting. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Fabricated information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of EC-130H mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
<b>STEP BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Well organized and concise; presented relevant facts in timely fashion. Appropriate for the particular mission. Highlighted changes and updates since mission briefing. Correct classification.
Q-	Made updates with prompting--not proactive. Omissions would not have affected mission effectiveness.
U	Completely missed an update or passed on erroneous information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of EC-130H mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
<b>MISSION TRACKING</b>	
Q	Used all resources (systems, operations, command post, onboard datalink) to track progress of missions. Well prepared to receive information during various stages. All relevant mission information pre-filled on debrief forms. Aware of all cancelled or diverted missions. Made provisions for debrief at diverted location via personnel or other electronic means. All personnel had access to mission tracking and could quickly interpret information to derive mission status.
Q-	Did not utilize resources well. Made updates to tracking mechanism with prompting, not proactive. All personnel could not quickly derive mission status. Debrief forms not pre-filled with mission information.
U	No mechanism for effectively updating status of missions. Most personnel not capable of interpreting or updating mission status. Unaware of cancelled missions. Completely missed an update or passed on erroneous information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of EC-130H mission capabilities. No plans for contacting divert locations for mission status and reporting information.
<b>MISSION DEBRIEFING</b>	
Q	Thoroughly prepared and able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Assembled and brought requisite materials for use to the debriefing.

	Quickly identified perishable information and ensured prompt dissemination as applicable. Controlled the debriefing, asked amplifying questions and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements IAW checklists and theater directives. Correctly annotated event log. Identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered.
U	Failed to use checklist. Not prepared. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed debrief. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements.
<b>INTELLIGENCE REPORTS</b>	
Q	Clearly written with target audience in mind. Summarized all pertinent information available with minimal to no extraneous info. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Produced report IAW checklists and theater directives. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality intelligence report. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. Minor problems with clarity, organization or formatting, but pertinent information was included.
U	Did not complete report within prescribed timelines. Failed to use checklist. Incomplete/inaccurate report. Writing skills confused meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g. not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). Incorrect classification.
<b>CCATT INTELLIGENCE REPORTING</b>	
Q	Clearly written with target audience in mind. Summarized all pertinent information available with minimal to no extraneous information. Properly formatted. Produced report IAW checklists and local directives. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor problems with clarity, organization or formatting, but pertinent information was included.
U	Failed to use checklist. Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills confused meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g. not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). Incorrect classification.
<b>CCATT RFI RESPONSE</b>	
Q	Information provided is clear and concise. Intelligence is correct and accurate with justification and analysis provided. RFI response meets time constraints and is correctly formatted in the method requested.
Q-	Information provided is correct but not completely analyzed and applied to the specific situation. RFI meets time constraints but there are errors in the provided format or delivery method.
U	Information provided is not correct and does not answer the question that was asked. Overall timelines were not met and/or RFI answer in incorrect format
<b>SIGINT REPORTING ANALYSIS</b>	
Q	Researched all relevant and available reports. Data extracted was correct, relevant to COMPASS CALL mission, analysis performed with no errors.

Q-	Researched most relevant and available reports. Data extracted was correct but no analysis was performed. Minor errors and typos were noted during data extraction.
U	Failed to research relevant and available reports. When reports were researched, extracted wrong data. Did not obtain most current SIGINT reports, did not look for updates to initial reporting
<b>SIGNALS OF INTEREST</b>	
Q	SOI list is complete. Signal data is correct and spreadsheet is usable by MPC with no questions.
Q-	SOI list is complete with minor errors and corrections required. SOI is usable by MPC but questions are required for clarification
U	SOI is incorrect and/or incomplete. Major errors with signal data and clearly identifiable target intel gaps. Products is unusable by MPC.
<b>C3 DIAGRAMS</b>	
Q	Functional and geographical links and nodes are correct. Listed complete criticality rating for each node and link. Provided analysis and vulnerabilities for each node and link
Q-	Functional and geographical links and nodes have minor errors. Criticality rankings have minor errors. Provided limited analysis and vulnerabilities for each node and link, still requires additional research
U	Functional and geographical links and nodes incorrect. No criticality rankings assigned. Limited analysis or vulnerabilities provided for diagrams.
<b>C3 TARGET NOMINATION LIST</b>	
Q	No errors in TNL. All targets are properly identified and justification is provided for individual targets. All mission requirements are addressed by nominated targets
Q-	Minor errors in TNL. All targets are properly identified but justification is not complete or through. Does not meet all mission requirements
U	Major errors in TNL. Targets nominated do not meet mission requirements, no justifications have been provided.
<b>C3 ANALYSIS BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items IAW checklist. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information and glean relevant data through a clear understanding of research methods and sources. Identified rationale for target selection and how it meets mission objectives. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of COMPASS CALL.
Q-	Presentation somewhat lacking in quality but all required areas were covered. Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poorly organized, confusing. Major gaps in information. Unable to conduct basic research; lack of analytical ability. Unable to recover with prompting. Poor understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the

	mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
<b>CCATT MISSION CREW DEBRIEFING</b>	
Q	Thoroughly prepared and was able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Assembled and brought requisite materials for use to the debriefing. Quickly identified perishable information and ensured prompt dissemination as applicable. Controlled the debriefing, asked amplifying questions and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements IAW checklists and theater directives. Correctly annotated event log. Identified significant events. Correct classification/security markings on all products.
Q-	Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered.
U	Failed to use checklist. Not prepared. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed debrief. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements.

**3.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria.** The evaluation criteria in Tables 3.3 and 3.4 apply to tasks associated with the duty positions in which personnel maintain specialized qualifications.

**Table 3.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.**

<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY - GENERAL</b>	
Q	Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated and met all objectives. Effectively fielded and accurately answered questions from audience. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Able to quickly retrieve answers/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification.
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – THREAT SYSTEMS</b>	
Q	Determined appropriate threat training requirements. Used AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Tailored threat training to the unit’s mission design series (MDS), mission specific requirements and appropriate audience (e.g. aircrews, security forces, etc). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization

	of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Did not use AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from effectiveness. Incorrect classification/security markings.
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – COLLECTION AND REPORTING</b>	
Q	Determined appropriate collection and reporting training requirements. Included aircrew originated reports (in-flight report, etc.), intelligence-generated reports (MISREP, INTREP, etc.) and essential elements of information. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3 and the appropriate theater reporting directive. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or reporting directives. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Did not use appropriate theater reporting directive as the primary reference for training. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or reporting directives. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – VISUAL RECOGNITION</b>	
Q	Determined appropriate VR training requirements. Included enemy/adversary, friendly, and neutral aircraft, surface threat, ground equipment and naval vessel recognition features. Incorporated all aspects/angles, theater-specific paint schemes/fin flashes, and various configurations along with the name or numerical designator of all enemy/blue/gray weapons systems presented. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small

	deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or items to include in training. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or sources. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from effectiveness. Incorrect classification/security markings.
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – PERSONNEL RECOVERY</b>	
Q	Determined appropriate PR training requirements. Coordinated with tactics, aircrew flight equipment (AFE) and survival, evasion, resistance and escape (SERE) personnel. Provided academic instruction on PR operational support processes. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or coordination process. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Did not coordinate with tactics, AFE and SERE personnel. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or sources. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification/security markings.
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – FORCE PROTECTION INTELLIGENCE</b>	
Q	Determined appropriate FPI training requirements. Included intelligence principles and procedures for FPI; summary of hostile forces in AOR and other hot spot areas; examples of hostile forces' tactics and weapons employment; FPI resources; terrorist threat levels; and unit FPI considerations. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or FPI resources. Minor problems in communicating or organization of

	instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2EC-130H Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or sources. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from effectiveness. Incorrect classification/security markings.

**Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria.**

INTELLIGENCE EVALUATOR PROFICIENCY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to evaluate effectively. Planned evaluation efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all objectives. Displayed thorough knowledge of evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation preparation. Completed appropriate evaluation records accurately. Adequately assessed and recorded performance. Comments were clear and pertinent. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge regarding unit procedures, evaluation requirements or documentation. Minor problems in communicating or organization of evaluation. Did not adversely affect the evaluation. Minor errors or omissions in evaluation records. Comments were incomplete or slightly unclear.
U	Inability to effectively communicate evaluation procedures to the examinee. Did not plan evaluation efficiently and/or made poor decisions that adversely affected the evaluation process. Unfamiliar with evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation preparation. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from evaluator effectiveness. Did not complete required forms or records. Comments were invalid, unclear, or did not accurately document performance. Incorrect classification.

Larry D. James, Lieutenant General, USAF  
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Surveillance,  
and Reconnaissance

**Attachment 1****GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION*****References***

AFI 11-2EC-130H, Volume 2, EC-130H Aircrew Evaluation Criteria, 7 September 2010

AFI 11-401, Aviation Management, 10 December 2010

AFI 14-104, Oversight of Intelligence Activities, 23 April 2012

AFI 14-119, Intelligence Support to Force Protection, 4 May 2012

AFI 14-124, Predictive Battlespace Awareness, 25 November 2008

AFI 14-2EC-130H, Volume 1, EC-130H COMPASS CALL Unit Intelligence Training, 28 November 2012

AFI 14-2EC-130H, Volume 3, EC-130H Unit Intelligence Procedures, 28 November 2012

AFI 14-202, Volume 1, Intelligence Training, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-202, Volume 3, General Intelligence Rules, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-205, Geospatial Information and Services, 5 May 2010

AFI 16-1301, Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape (SERE) Program, 6 September 2006

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013

AFI 36-2201, Air Force Training Program, 15 September 2010

AFMAN 33-363, Management of Records, 1 March 2008

AFPD 14-2, Intelligence Rules and Procedures, 29 November 2007

AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide*, 2 May 2014 (S)

AFTTP 3-1.EC-130H, Tactical Employment—EC-130H, 17 December 2010 (S)

FM 1-02, Operational Terms and Graphics, 21 September 04

MIL STD 2525C, Common Warfighting Symbology, 17 November 2008

FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*, 21 September 2004

***Adopted Forms***

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, 22 September 2009

AF Form 4349, *Record of Intelligence Evaluation*, 10 March 2008

AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*, 10 March 2008

AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, 10 March 2008

***Abbreviations and Acronyms***

A2—Directorate of Intelligence

**ACC**—Air Combat Command  
**ACO**—Airspace Control Order  
**AF**—Air Force  
**AFE**—Aircrew Flight Equipment  
**AFI**—Air Force Instruction  
**AFMAN**—Air Force Manual  
**AFPD**—Air Force Policy Directive  
**ANG**—Air National Guard  
**AOR**—Area of Responsibility  
**ATO**—Air Tasking Order  
**C3**—Command, Control, and Communications  
**CCATT**—COMPASS CALL Analysis and Targeting Team  
**EIT**—External Intelligence Trainer  
**FPI**—Force Protection Intelligence  
**IAW**—In Accordance With  
**IE**—Intelligence Evaluator  
**INIT MSN**—Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation  
**INTREP**—Intelligence Report  
**IPOE**—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment  
**ISR**—Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance  
**MAJCOM**—Major Command  
**MDS**—Mission Design Series  
**MGRS**—Military Grid Reference System  
**MISREP**—Mission Report  
**MPC**—Mission Planning Cell  
**MQF**—Master Question File  
**MSN**—Mission Qualification Evaluation  
**OB**—Order of Battle  
**OPR**—Office of Primary Responsibility  
**PR**—Personnel Recovery  
**RAD**—Research, Analysis and Dissemination  
**RFI**—Request for Information

**RSTA**—Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition

**SERE**—Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape

**SIGINT**—Signals Intelligence

**SOI**—Signal of Interest

**SPINS**—Special Instructions

**T-2**—Tier 2

**T-3**—Tier 3

**TNL**—Target Nomination List

**USAF**—United States Air Force

**VR**—Visual Recognition

### *Terms*

**Tier 2 (T-2)**—Non-compliance has the potential to create moderate risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the MAJCOM/CC level, but may not be delegated lower than MAJCOM Director.

**Tier 3 (T-3)**—Non-compliance has a relatively remote potential to create risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the Wing/DRU/FOA CC level.