BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2F-15C, VOLUME 2

20 JULY 2012

Incorporating Change 1, 7 AUGUST 2014

Intelligence

F-15C UNIT INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION CRITERIA

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available for downloading on the e-Publishing website at **www.e-Publishing.af.mil**

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: ACC/A2

Certified by: AF/A2D
(Brig Gen Mark W. Westergren)

Supersedes: AFI 14-2F-15CV2, 22 September 2008

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 F-15C units. This publication applies to Regular Air Force (RegAF), Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting F-15C 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. In order for units to have time to prepare for compliance, this publication becomes effective 60 days after the publication date.

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.

Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION **3**

1.1. General. 3

1.2. Procedures. 3

1.3. Evaluation Instructions. 4

1.4. Additional Training. 4

1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance. 4

Chapter 2—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS **5**

2.1. General. 5

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations. 5

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations. 6

2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations. 8

Chapter 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA **9**

3.1. General Evaluation Standards. 9

3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. 9

Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. 9

3.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria. 14

Table 3.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria. 14

Table 3.3. Aerospace Control Alert Mission Planning and Intelligence Execution Evaluation Criteria. 17

Table 3.4. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria. 18

Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION **19**

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 instruction.

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. Office of Primary Responsibility. The Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (AF/A2) delegates OPR for this instruction to Air Combat Command Directorate of Intelligence (ACC)/A2.

1.1.3. Waivers. MAJCOM/A2 is the waiver authority for specific requirements outlined in this instruction. MAJCOM/A2s will courtesy-copy ACC/A2 regarding all waiver correspondence. ACC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of significant trends in waiver correspondence if such correspondence indicates the need to readdress existing policy and guidance.

1.2. 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 (MQT) or Specialized Training (ST) requirements outlined in AFI 14-2F-15C, Volume 1, *F-15C Unit Intelligence Training*. (T-2)

1.2.2. IEs will use the evaluation criteria in Chapter 3 to conduct 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 beginning 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 evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 5. Document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 7. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing or post-mission 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 instruction. 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. The IE will use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, to assist in grading the individual areas during the evaluation. The form used by the evaluator will be a blank AF Form 4381, not the one completed on the individual during MQT/ST. The F-15C gradesheet task elements are found in Attachments 3 and 4 of AFI 14-2F-15C, Volume 1. (T-3)

1.3.2. In addition to the guidance provided by this instruction, IEs will be expected to use their personal experience and knowledge in the assessment of examinee performance. (T-3)

1.4. Additional Training. IEs are responsible for recommending additional training as necessary. 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 an initial or subsequent 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 mission duties unless specifically restricted. (T-2)

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. General. The intelligence evaluation must include the areas listed in this chapter as depicted in Table 2.1, *Intelligence Evaluations*. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.

SUBJECT	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE	ACA
Knowledge Evaluations					
F-15C Weapons Systems Academics	R	R	----	----	----
Threat Knowledge	R	R	----	----	----
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	R	R	----	----	----
Visual Recognition	R	R	----	----	----
Personnel Recovery	R	R	----	----	----
Force Protection Intelligence	R	R	----	----	----
Performance Task Evaluations					
Threat Briefing	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/Airspace Control Order/ Special Instructions (ATO/ACO/SPINS) and Other Tasking Documents	R	R	----	----	----
Intelligence Support to Mission Planning	R	R	----	----	----
Mission Package Construction	R	R	----	----	----
Mission Briefing	R	R	----	----	----
Step Briefing	R	R	----	----	----
Mission Tracking	R	R	----	----	----
Debriefing	R	R	----	----	----
Intelligence Reports	R	R	----	----	----
Specialized Task Evaluations					
Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) Mission Planning and Intelligence Execution	----	----	----	----	R
Instructional Ability	----	----	R	----	----
Evaluator Ability	----	----	----	R	----

NOTES:
Gradesheet templates for each area are included in AFI14-2F-15C, 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
ACA = Aerospace Control Alert Evaluation (conducted in conjunction with MSN Evals)

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations.

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 F-15C systems and capabilities, threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapons systems, visual recognition (VR), personnel recovery (PR), and force protection intelligence (FPI). 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. Knowledge examinations may also be required during specialized qualification evaluations. Research, analysis and dissemination (RAD) and intelligence preparation of the operational environment (IPOE) involves knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of the performance task evaluations and will be evaluated as subsets of each applicable performance task. (T-2)

2.2.2. Performance Task Evaluation. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based off of 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. 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 Symbology* and US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, FM 1-02, *Operational Terms and Graphics*.

2.2.2.1.1. Manual Order of Battle. The number of OB items in the plotting exercise will be of sufficient volume 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.

2.2.2.1.2. 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 information's accuracy for a particular AOR.

2.2.2.2. Intelligence Briefings. Briefings should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, and imagery. Other sources that are used to evaluate other mission areas may also be used. Evaluated briefings include: threat briefings, initial situation briefing, situation briefing, changeover briefings, deployment briefing, mission briefing, and step briefing.

2.2.2.3. Air Tasking Order, Airspace Control Order and Special Instructions (ATO/ACO/SPINS) and other tasking documents. Scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials will 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 the elements of ATO/ACO/SPINS to include unit tasking, striker mission being supported, air space control, personnel recovery and intelligence information. As applicable, personnel should be evaluated on other types of tasking requests they may face in particular theaters.

2.2.2.4. Intelligence Support to Mission Planning. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials or exercise/range imagery will be used. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in planning, coordinating and conducting the entire mission planning process. Provide enough information to evaluate the examinee's ability to analyze the tactical problem/scenario, threat considerations, terrain, and weather, target imagery, route/avenue(s) of approach recommendation(s), as appropriate. Evaluate proficiency in identify and plotting unit tasking. Specific pieces of information should be purposefully omitted to evaluate the examinee's ability to define intelligence gaps and submit requests for information. Information for the situation briefing should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, and imagery.

2.2.2.5. Mission Package Construction. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials or exercise/range imagery will be used. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in obtaining necessary mission materials to include required imagery and geospatial information and services to build mission materials. Demonstrate proficiency in utilizing mission planning software to construct mission packages; and analysis.

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 ongoing missions.

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

2.2.2.8. Intelligence Reports. Construct mission reports (MISREP) and intelligence reports (INTREP) using information provided in the pilot debriefing. Complete reports IAW theater intelligence reporting directives.

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 performance task evaluation and be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Upon completion of profile EIT 1 and one or all of the remaining profiles outlined in AFI 14-2F-15C, Volume 1, the EIT trainer will demonstrate knowledge of the information presented by successfully completing a test based on the questions from the master question file (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 4 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. Document the evaluation in coordination with AF/A2 approved processes regarding online documentation. The individual must maintain currency and be reevaluated periodically for the subject matter according to AFI 14-2F-15C, 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. Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) Evaluation. ACA evaluations will consist of a performance task evaluation and be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. The ACA and all applicable MSN areas must be evaluated. (T-3)

2.3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation. IE evaluations will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Individuals will be qualified to be IEs upon completion of the IE specialized training profiles, successful IE evaluation and endorsement by the Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO). IEs will be evaluated using criteria in Chapter 3. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. (T-3)

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation criteria apply to tasks associated with the duty positions or work centers in which personnel maintain mission qualifications.

Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answers at least 85% of questions in a test based on master question file.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Fails to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in VR test.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Fails to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in VR test.
THREAT BRIEFING	
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 F-15C 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 F-15C, but not many. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Threat was not tailored to F-15C 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 F-15C mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
SITUATION DISPLAYS (Includes MANUAL and AUTOMATED OB)	
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, *Common Warfighting Symbology* and US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, FM 1-02, *Operational Terms and Graphics*. 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 produced.
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.
INITIAL SITUATION BRIEFING	
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 produced.
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.
SITUATION BRIEFING	
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 produced.
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.
CHANGEOVER BRIEFING	
Q	Well planned, appropriate checklist usage, addressed relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls to pass 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 the 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.
DEPLOYMENT BRIEFING	
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.
ATO/ACO/SPINS AND OTHER TASKING DOCUMENTS	
Q	Demonstrated ability to access the correct ATO/ACO/SPINS and any changes. Correctly extracted mission tasking, striker mission being supported, airspace control

	measures, personnel recovery and other information relevant to unit or tasking. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have impacted mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO MISSION PLANNING	
Q	Effective use of checklist. Used appropriate research and analysis techniques in reviewing the ATO/ACO/SPINS breakout, unit IPOE, target acquisition, threat considerations (integrated air defense system, air, surface-to-air missiles, air defense/anti-aircraft artillery), tactics, terrain, and weather, target imagery, route/avenue(s) of approach recommendation(s), as appropriate. Correctly identified and plotted unit tasking. Recognized information gaps and submitted requests for information through appropriate channels. Situation briefing was effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Required some assistance, but no impact on mission planning functions. Briefing could be better prepared or organized. Some difficulty with use of mission materials. Minor omission of intelligence information required for mission; however nothing that was critical to mission planning.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poor understanding of the requirements or lack of adequate mission materials delayed mission planning timeline. Major omissions of information critical to the planning cycle. Organization or lack of preparation seriously impacted understanding of the briefing. Incorrect classification.
MISSION PACKAGE CONSTRUCTION	
Q	Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Demonstrated clear understanding and proper use of mission planning materials. Chose scales and views appropriate for mission. Knew proper channels for requesting information or materials. Accurate portrayal of area threats, striker targets and hazards as well as ingress and egress factors to consider. Tailored mission materials to the type of mission being planned and assigned weapons load. Provided all mission materials in correct quantities and of sufficient detail. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment. Provided thorough analysis of threats, route, and combat air patrol (CAP) area(s). Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Errors or minor omissions in mission materials which would not preclude mission accomplishment. Minor problems in organizing mission materials and identifying and ordering requirements. Corrected when prompted.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Major omissions or errors which would have impacted mission. Poor understanding of mission requirements or sources for mission materials. Chose incorrect scales or views for mission materials. Did not know striker targets. Incorrectly plotted target areas or threats. Did not know how to request information. Did not provide analysis of threats, route, or CAP area. Incorrect classification.

MISSION BRIEFING	
Q	Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. 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: takeoff, ingress, CAP area, egress, divert airfields, 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 identified significant events and issued 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 or errors but recovered when prompted with 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 with prompting. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of IPOE concepts. Fabricated information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of F-15C mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
STEP BRIEFING	
Q	Well organized and concise; presented relevant facts in timely fashion and IAW local requirements. Appropriate for the particular mission. Identified, analyzed and 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 F-15C mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
MISSION TRACKING	
Q	Used all resources (systems, operations, command post) to track progress of missions. Well organized to receive information during various stages. All relevant mission information pre-filled on debriefing 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 F-15C mission capabilities. No plans for contacting divert locations for mission status and reporting information.
DEBRIEFING	
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 time-sensitive 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. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Debrief took too long. Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered. Slow in dealing with time-sensitive information.
U	Failed to use checklist. Not prepared, didn't have materials for debrief. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed a debriefing. Lost control of the debriefing. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE REPORTS	
Q	Clearly written with target audience in mind. Summarized all pertinent information available and included an initial level of tactical analysis with minimal to no extraneous info. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Produced report IAW checklists and theater directives. Correctly identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced. Appropriate knowledge of US Message Text Format (USMTF), if required.
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. Working knowledge of USMTF, but required some assistance.
U	Did not complete report within prescribed timelines. Report was not in format required by theater intelligence reporting directive. 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). No knowledge of USMTF. Incorrect classification.

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

Table 3.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.

INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY - GENERAL	
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 produced.
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.

INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – THREAT SYSTEMS	
Q	Determined appropriate threat training requirements. Used Air Force Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Tailored threat training to the unit's MDS, mission specific requirements and appropriate audience (e.g. pilots, security forces). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2F-15C Volume 3, *Unit Intelligence Procedures*. 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 produced.
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 14-2F-15C 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, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – COLLECTION AND REPORTING	
Q	Determined appropriate collection and reporting training requirements. Included pilot originated reports (in-flight reports (INFLTREP), etc.), intelligence-generated reports (MISREP, INTREP, etc.) and essential elements of information (EEI). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2F-15C 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 produced.
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 14-2F-15C 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.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – VISUAL RECOGNITION	
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/friendly/neutral weapons systems presented. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2F-15C 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 produced.
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 14-2F-15C 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 and/or security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – PERSONNEL RECOVERY	
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 14-2F-15C 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 produced.
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 14-2F-15C 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 and/or security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – FORCE PROTECTION INTELLIGENCE	
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 14-2F-15C 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 produced.
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 14-2F-15C 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 and/or security markings.

Table 3.3. Aerospace Control Alert Mission Planning and Intelligence Execution Evaluation Criteria.

AEROSPACE CONTROL ALERT MISSION PLANNING/INTELLIGENCE EXECUTION	
Q	Coordinated, directed, supervised, or conducted (as required) activities IAW local procedures. Demonstrated proficiency in individual duty position responsibilities. Clearly understood ACA mission tasking and was able to address all factors relevant to the mission. Well organized and fully prepared. Made appropriate selection and effective use of planning materials and resources. Provided all mission materials in correct quantities and of sufficient detail. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment. Provided thorough analysis. Identified shortfalls in information, recommendations for production/information requests. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact ACA mission planning and intelligence execution. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Poorly organized or unprepared. 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. Incorrect classification.

Table 3.4. 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 produced.
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

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

AFI 11-2F-15, Volume 2, *F-15 Aircrew Evaluation Criteria*, 3 February 2004

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 14-2F-15C, Volume 1, *F-15C Unit Intelligence Training*, 20 July 2014

AFI 14-2F-15C, Volume 3, *F-15C Unit Intelligence Procedures*, 20 July 2014

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

AFTTP 3-1.F-15, *Tactical Employment F-15*, 1 November 2007 (S)

AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*, 2 July 2010 (S)

Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS)

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

ACA—Aerospace Control Alert

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

AFTTP—Air Force Tactics, Techniques and Procedures

ANG—Air National Guard

AOR—Area of Responsibility

ATO—Air Tasking Order

CAP—Combat Air Patrol

EEI—Essential Elements of Information

EIT—External Intelligence Training

FPI—Force Protection Intelligence

IAW—In Accordance With

IE—Intelligence Evaluator

INFLTREP—In-flight Report

INIT IE—Initial Intelligence Evaluator Qualification Evaluation

INIT MSN—Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation

INTREP—Intelligence Report

IPOE—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment

MAJCOM—Major Command

MGRS—Military Grid Reference System

MISREP—Mission Report

MQF—Master Question File

MQT—Mission Qualification Training

MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation

OB—Order of Battle

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

PR—Personnel Recovery

RAD—Research, Analysis and Dissemination

SERE—Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape

SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer

SPINS—Special Instructions

ST—Specialized Training

T-2—Tier 2

T-3—Tier 3

USMTF—US Message Text Format

VR—Visual Recognition

Terms

Aerospace Control Alert (ACA)—The integrated tasks of surveillance and control, the execution of which enforces a nation's authority over its territorial airspace. ACA refers to the specialized training tailored to address specific intelligence requirements to support the ACA mission.

ATO/ACO/SPINS Breakout—Identifying and breaking out the elements of the air tasking order, airspace control order and special instructions.

Automated OB—Order of battle maintained using intelligence support systems.

Changeover Briefing—A briefing to provide incoming personnel a synopsis of events and issues to prepare them for their shift. Include issues needing immediate attention, pending tasks, personnel and equipment problems, work center status and briefing times.

Currency—A measure of how frequently and/or recently a task is completed. Currency requirements should ensure intelligence personnel maintain a minimum level of proficiency in a given event.

Debriefing—The process to convert mission information into intelligence for dissemination to affected parties. The intelligence specialist will extract relevant mission intelligence from pilots, ask amplifying questions relevant to the mission, identify time-sensitive information and disseminate appropriately and expediently.

Debriefed Discrepancy—Remedial action taken by an intelligence evaluator to remedy a discrepancy noted during an evaluation. This action is accomplished during debrief of the evaluation wherein the intelligence evaluator provides briefing/instruction concerning the discrepancy and determines that the examinee has gained the necessary knowledge or proficiency to remedy said discrepancy. The discrepancy area/subarea description is annotated with “Debriefed” in the Evaluator’s Remarks section of the AF Form 4350 Comments.

Deployment Briefing—A briefing to provide intelligence information to pilots, key staff, and deploying personnel prior to deployment. Intelligence information is tailored to the unit’s specific mission, roles and combat profiles IAW the unit OPLAN/OPORD tasking. It includes a synopsis of the military and political situation generating the deployment, enemy activity and force disposition (air, ground and naval, as applicable) in the AOR and along deployment route, enemy tactics and employment strategies, potential and or anticipated enemy reactions to the deployment, possible en-route hazards to flight, bailout or alternate landing issues (for hostile, friendly and neutral areas), known threats (terrorist or regular military forces) in vicinity of bed down location, reporting instructions and essential elements of information (EEI) and additional items as dictated by the local situation.

External Intelligence Training (EIT)—Intelligence training given by intelligence personnel to pilots or other non-intelligence AFSC personnel.

External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer—Current and qualified (CMR or BMC) intelligence personnel who have completed the EIT specialized training and maintain currency as an EIT trainer. Only qualified and current trainers may conduct unsupervised intelligence training for pilots or other personnel in a non-intelligence Air Force Specialty Code.

Initial Evaluation—The first evaluation of any type for a duty position (e.g., INIT MSN, INIT EIT).

Initial Situation Briefing—The briefing conducted at the outset of a crisis that outlines the initial situation to the commander and staff. It includes the current situation, including major events leading to the crisis, any national decisions, enemy force disposition, current situation at deployment location, local area situation (e.g., terrorist activity, subversion threats, etc.), anticipated enemy reactions, possible en-route flight hazards for previously scheduled and transient flights.

Intelligence Evaluator (IE)—Current and qualified (CMR or BMC) intelligence personnel who have completed the IE specialized training. IEs conduct intelligence qualification (mission or specialized) evaluations (initial or periodic) and support unit Intelligence Stan/Eval functions.

Intelligence Evaluator (IE) Evaluation—An evaluation that qualifies and maintains the intelligence evaluator qualification of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member as an intelligence evaluator (i.e., INIT IE and RQ IE) as directed in this volume. The designator for the intelligence evaluator evaluation is "IE" as used with the AF Form 4349 and AF Form 4350.

Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment (IPOE)—An analytical methodology employed to reduce uncertainties concerning the enemy, environment, and terrain for all types of operations. Intelligence preparation of the operational environment builds and extensive data base for each potential area in which a unit may be required to operate. The database is then analyzed in detail to determine the impact of the enemy, environment, and terrain on operations and presents it in graphic form. Intelligence preparation of the operational environment is a continuing process.

Intelligence Reports—Reports generated by intelligence personnel to provide information to higher headquarters (e.g., Mission Reports (MISREPs) and Intelligence Reports (INTREPs)).

Manual OB—Order of battle maintained using maps and charts without automated intelligence system support.

Mission Briefing—A briefing to provide unit operators with the latest intelligence affecting the mission. Accurate and timely intelligence information should be provided on the general situation since the last briefing, mission information, general situation in the CAP/objective area, en route and mission area threats (SAMs/AAA/air/naval/laser and spectral interference threats/etc.), and other factors essential to mission success.

Mission Package Construction—The mission package provides the operator with the intelligence materials necessary to accomplish the mission. The mission package includes route maps, threat information and other local mission package requirements.

Mission Planning—The planning accomplished by intelligence personnel to support the operational mission. Mission planning provides operators with the intelligence materials necessary to accomplish the mission and may include route maps, imagery, and other local mission folder requirements. Pilots should receive the latest intelligence and most accurate information available on routes, CAP area, targets of strikers being supported, threats, evasion and recovery and other factors essential to planning the mission.

Mission Qualification Evaluation (MSN)—An evaluation that qualifies and maintains the qualification (CMR or BMC) of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member (i.e., INIT MSN, RQ MSN). The mission qualification

evaluation is administered to ensure the individual's ability to support full mission planning and employment in accomplishing the unit's operational mission. The designator for the mission qualification evaluation is "MSN" as used with the AF Form 4349 and AF Form 4350.

Mission Tracking—Maintaining situational awareness of ongoing missions by monitoring mission execution and communicating with other mission related agencies and coordination centers.

Personnel Recovery (PR)—The aggregation of military, civil, and political efforts to obtain the release or recovery of personnel from uncertain or hostile environments and denied areas whether they are captured, missing, or isolated.

Research, Analysis, Dissemination (RAD)—The ability to brief and report intelligence concerning major potential threat adversaries, to include military, political and geographic by researching, analyzing and disseminating tailored intelligence to pilots, commanders, and base support agencies.

Situation Briefing—The briefing which provides the latest intelligence to assist commanders, staff and pilots in their decision making. It incorporates significant military and or political events, enemy force disposition (ground, air and air defense, naval, as applicable), indications of impending enemy attack, enemy tactics and or employment strategies, potential course of enemy action, local area situation (terrorism, sabotage, subversion threats, etc.).

Specialized Qualification Evaluation—An evaluation that qualifies a trainee in a specialized area. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member for a particular skill or duty position. Specific types of specialized qualification evaluations are identified in this volume.

Step Briefing—A briefing given to pilots immediately prior to departure for tasked mission. The step briefing provides the pilots with last minute intelligence affecting their mission and highlights changes in the intelligence situation since the mission briefing.

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.