

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

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2MQ-1&9,
VOLUME 2**



3 APRIL 2014

Intelligence

***MQ-1 & MQ-9 UNIT INTELLIGENCE
EVALUATION CRITERIA***

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available for download 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 Donald J. Bacon)

Pages: 19

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 evaluating and qualifying personnel performing intelligence duties in MQ-1&9 units. This publication applies to Regular Air Force, Reserve and Air National Guard intelligence personnel supporting MQ-1&9 operations. The National Guard Bureau will be considered functionally as a major command (MAJCOM) for the purposes of this publication. This publication requires the collection or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974. Privacy Act System of Records Notice F011 AF AFMC B, Patriot Excalibur, covers required information. The authority to maintain the records prescribed in this publication are Title 10 U.S.C. 8013, *Secretary of the Air Force*; AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*, and Executive Order 9397, *Numbering System for Federal Accounts Relating To Individual Persons*, as amended by Executive Order 13478, *Amendments to Executive Order 9397 Relating to Federal Agency Use of Social Security Numbers*. 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 publication 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 MAJCOM 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*, Table 1.1 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.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General. This volume provides guidance for the MQ-1&9 intelligence standardization and evaluation program. With the cited references, it establishes the procedures and criteria for evaluating intelligence personnel during the knowledge and task phases of initial and periodic evaluations. **Exception:** The provisions contained in this AFI do not apply to intelligence personnel performing instructor and support duties at the MQ-1&9 Formal Training Unit. These procedures are the minimum and can be supplemented with unit-level written guidance. Unit-level guidance will not be less restrictive.

1.2. References. The primary references for MQ-1&9 intelligence standardization and evaluations are AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1, *MQ-1 and 9 Unit Intelligence Training*; AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 3, *MQ-1 and 9 Unit Intelligence Procedures*; Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*; AFTTP 3-1.MQ-1, *Tactical Employment—MQ-1*; AFTTP 3-1.MQ-9, *Tactical Employment—MQ-9*.

1.3. Waivers. MAJCOM/A2s will courtesy-copy ACC/A2 regarding all waiver requests and responses. ACC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of significant trends in waiver correspondence if such correspondence indicates the need to readdress existing policy and guidance.

1.4. Procedures.

1.4.1. Conduct and document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified Intelligence Evaluator (IE), the examinee must have successfully completed all duty position required Mission Qualification Training (MQT) or Specialized Training (ST) requirements outlined in AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1. (T-2)

1.4.2. Evaluations will be accomplished in a realistic training environment and in conjunction with local events to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to conduct evaluations in a realistic environment, use an alternate method (e.g., simulated, staged, or verbal). Document the reasons for and type of alternate method used in the comments section of the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*. (T-2)

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

1.4.4. 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)

1.4.5. 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. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level. (T-3)

1.4.6. The IE will use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, to assist in grading individual areas during the evaluation. The form used by the evaluator will be a blank AF

Form 4381, not the one completed by the trainer during MQT/ST. Gradesheet elements specific to MQ-1&9 intelligence tasks are found in attachments 3 and 4 of AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1. (T-3)

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

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

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

1.6. 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 evaluation, they will not perform duties related to the evaluated task unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. (T-2)

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. General. The intelligence evaluation must include areas listed in this chapter as they relate to the examinee's duty position as depicted in Table 2.1, Intelligence Evaluations. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.

SUBJECT	INIT MSN		MSN		MIC	IOS	IE
	MSA	TDA	MSA	TDA			
Knowledge Evaluations							
MQ-1&9 Weapons Systems Academics	---	---	R	R	---	---	---
Threat Knowledge	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
Key Missions	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
Mission Partners	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
Mission Planning Resources	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
MQ-1&9 Communications Infrastructure	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
Intelligence Reporting	---	---	R	---	---	---	---
TDA Roles and Responsibilities	---	---	---	R	---	---	---
Collateral Damage Estimation (CDE)	---	---	---	R	---	---	---
Performance Task Evaluations							
Workstation Setup	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Mission Resource Utilization	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Situation Displays	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Ad Hoc Tasking Procedures	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Special Payload Procedures	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Find/Fix/Track	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Sensor Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) Integration/Cross-Cue	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Time-Sensitive Reporting	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Intelligence Reports	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Intelligence Briefing	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
Pre-mission Support	R	---	R	---	---	---	---
TDA Workstation Utilization	---	R	---	R	---	---	---
Payload and Weaponing	---	R	---	R	---	---	---
Targeting Products	---	R	---	R	---	---	---
Specialized Task Evaluations							
Distributed Mission Crew Communication	---	---	---	---	R	---	---

Handover Procedures	---	---	---	---	R	---	---
Target/Engage/Assess	---	---	---	---	R	---	---
Video Downlink Procedures	---	---	---	---	R	---	---
Mission Preparation	---	---	---	---	---	R	---
Product Quality Control	---	---	---	---	---	R	---
Mission Management	---	---	---	---	---	R	---
Weapons Employment	---	---	---	---	---	R	---
Evaluator Ability	---	---	---	---	---		R
<p>Notes: Gradesheet templates for each area are included in AFI14-2MQ-1&9, 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 IOS = Intelligence Operations Supervisor MSN = Mission Qualification Evaluation MSA = Mission Support Analyst TDA = Target Development Analyst MIC= Mission Intelligence Coordinator Qualification Evaluation IE = Intelligence Evaluator Qualification Evaluation</p>							

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations.

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluations. Conduct knowledge evaluations as part of the periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's knowledge of MQ-1&9 systems and capabilities, threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapons systems, key missions, mission partners, mission planning resources, MQ-1&9 communications infrastructure, intelligence reporting, TDA roles and responsibilities, and CDE. Examinees will complete a test from the unit's master question file (MQF) for knowledge evaluation areas. Research, analysis and dissemination 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 Evaluations. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed materials based on current intelligence, unit tasking, and area of responsibility (AOR) scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. The following guidelines assist the IE in conducting performance evaluations. (T-2)

2.2.2.1. Workstation Setup. Evaluate the examinee's ability to prepare for an MQ-1&9 mission using real-world workstations, systems and applications IAW local procedures. The IE will ensure functional workstations are available and access to current checklists. (T-3)

2.2.2.2. Mission Resource Utilization. Evaluate the examinee's proficiency in accessing and extracting applicable data from mission resource documents applicable to the unit's mission. The IE will use scenario or actual contingency/exercise mission resources (e.g., Air Tasking Order (ATO), Airspace Control Order (ACO), Joint Tactical Air Request (JTAR), Special Instructions (SPINS), Reconnaissance, Surveillance, and Target

Acquisition (RSTA) Annex, Airspace Control Plan (ACP), ISR target deck and ISR 8-Line). If using a scenario or simulated materials, provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit tasked. (T-3)

2.2.2.3. Situation Displays. Evaluate the examinee's ability to use intelligence systems to construct, post, update, and maintain quality situation displays based on unit mission and Operations Plan /Concept Plan tasking. Include a large variety of items to challenge the examinee to conduct research and analysis to determine the relevance of the data to the situation. The number of items to plot will be of sufficient volume to be challenging, yet not so overwhelming that the time taken is beyond that necessary to determine proficiency. Evaluate the examinee's ability to convert between coordinate systems. Scenarios 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. Provide the examinee with a variety of order of battle (OB) sources from which to pull data. Evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and save overlay 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. (T-3)

2.2.2.4. Ad Hoc Tasking Procedures. Evaluate the examinee's proficiency in coordinating ad hoc taskings such as dynamic or non-interference basis requests, with appropriate collection managers, close air support and/or ISR controlling authorities as required by unit mission. The IE will ensure the scenario depicts notional ad hoc requests routed both properly and improperly to present the opportunity for the examinee to discern between the two. The scenario will include clues as to why/when the supported unit initiated an ad hoc request. (T-3)

2.2.2.5. Special Payload Procedures. Evaluate the examinee's proficiency in optimizing MQ-1&9 employment. Scenarios will test the examinee's ability to describe the capabilities of special payloads employed by the unit's MQ-1&9 aircraft. The examinee must be able to recommend utilization of MQ-1&9 aircraft in order to optimize onboard sensors and coordinate with mission and mission partners during payload utilization. (T-3)

2.2.2.6. Find/Fix/Track. Evaluate the examinee's ability to maintain situational awareness on tasked targets as required by unit mission. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials (including inject cards or provided intelligence reports, message traffic, imagery or full-motion video (FMV)) may be used. Materials and systems provided will be sufficient for the IE to determine the examinee's ability to locate a target within a search area, use available technology to conduct IPOE on the target and surrounding area and provide situational awareness to the MQ-1&9 crew members. The number of planned and ad hoc targets in this exercise will be of sufficient volume to be challenging, yet not so overwhelming that the time taken is beyond that necessary to determine proficiency. Evaluate the examinee's ability to identify, process, analyze and update the MQ-1&9 pilot/sensor operator (SO) on target locations, characteristics, status, and to analyze key events, situations or information that could potentially impact the MQ-1&9 flight path, sensor selection, sensor redirection or re-attack. (T-3)

2.2.2.7. Sensor ISR Integration/Cross-cue. Evaluate the examinee's ability to identify and execute sensor integration and cross-cueing opportunities with other assets and organizations as required by unit mission. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials may be used. The examinee will use actual or notional national, theater, and tactical assets to demonstrate the use of proper communication channels for retasking opportunities and provide feedback to all applicable mission crew members. (T-3)

2.2.2.8. Time-Sensitive Reporting. Evaluate the examinee's ability to use procedures for reporting actionable information and threat warning to crewmembers and mission partners. The IE may use scenario inject cards or provide intelligence reports, message traffic, imagery or FMV to fulfill this requirement. Information provided will facilitate time-sensitive reporting that challenges the examinee to identify and locate emergent threats. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to accurately assess the threat capabilities against the MQ-1&9 aircraft or ground elements and suggest countertactics. Information must be disseminated to the pilot/SO while it is still actionable. (T-3)

2.2.2.9. Intelligence Reports. Evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and transmit accurate reports as required by unit mission, including production of weapon system video (WSV) and/or imagery for attachment to intelligence reports. The IE will have the examinee prepare a variety of FMV clips or WSV products to illustrate local coordination procedures for systems typically used by the unit. IEs can incorporate one or more FMV clips or videos into the evaluation, as time and requirements permit. The IE will determine which intelligence report(s) are representative of the examinee's ability to construct and disseminate reports as required locally. Reports will be developed using information collected (scenario or actual contingency/exercise). Reports must be accurate and complete IAW standards. (T-3)

2.2.2.10. Intelligence Briefing. Evaluate the examinee's ability to prepare and present briefings. Briefings will be assembled from information provided by the evaluator, message traffic, intelligence reports, and other intelligence materials. Evaluate the research and analysis skills related to briefing preparation. Sources used to evaluate other mission areas may also be used. Evaluate the various briefings conducted in support of unit operations. (T-3)

2.2.2.11. Pre-mission Support. Evaluate the examinee's proficiency in mission planning to support MQ-1&9 crews. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials (friendly and adversary OB) may be used. Materials and systems provided will be sufficient for the IE to determine the examinee's ability to provide pertinent threat and target intelligence to mission crews pertaining to the current situation. Examinee must tailor products to tasked missions. (T-3)

2.2.2.12. TDA Workstation Utilization. Evaluate the examinee's knowledge of targeting and mission planning resources. The IE will ensure functional workstations are available and access to current checklists. The examinee must identify imagery databases and portals, mensuration software, weaponeering solutions software, CDE software, and FMV to meet the targeting and mission planning requirements of the unit. (T-3)

2.2.2.13. Payload & Weaponeering. Evaluate the examinee's ability to optimize MQ-1&9 employment when equipped with payloads. Scenarios will test the examinee's ability to describe the capabilities of weapons employed by the unit's MQ-1&9 aircraft.

The examinee must be able to recommend utilization of MQ-1&9 aircraft in order to optimize employment of weapons. (T-3)

2.2.2.14. Targeting Products. Objective: Evaluate the examinee's proficiency in verifying products to meet the targeting and mission planning requirements of the unit. Scenarios will test the examinee's ability to verify professional, accurate, and timely mensurated graphics, models that determine the best weaponeering solution, graphics that portray potential collateral concerns, and apply battle damage assessment (BDA) methodology as required. (T-3)

2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.

2.3.1. Mission Intelligence Coordinator Evaluations. Evaluate the examinee's ability to apply MIC concepts and execute MIC duties IAW minimum standards to fulfill MIC requirements. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based off current intelligence, unit tasking, and AOR scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management principles to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. Base MIC evaluations on the MIC training profiles in AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1. The IE will determine the examinee's knowledge and ability as a MIC in each applicable profile. (T-2)

2.3.2. Intelligence Operations Supervisor (IOS) Evaluations. Evaluate the examinee's ability to apply IOS concepts and execute IOS duties IAW minimum standards to fulfill IOS requirements. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based off current intelligence, unit tasking, and AOR scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management principles to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. Base IOS evaluations on the IOS training profiles in AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1. The IE will determine the examinee's knowledge and ability as a IOS in each applicable profile. (T-2)

2.3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation. Evaluate the examinee's ability to perform intelligence evaluations. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to describe evaluation criteria, grading procedures, and evaluation form preparation for an evaluation based on the IE training profiles in AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1. Provide scenarios for intelligence evaluations, objectivity issues, and techniques for conducting evaluations. IE evaluations will be conducted, when possible, by a qualified MQ-1&9 IE from outside the squadron. (T-2)

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. General Evaluation Standards. The evaluation criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: MQT and ST 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 answered at least 85% of questions in a test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable for knowledge evaluations.
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
WORKSTATION SETUP	
Q	Correctly configured intelligence workstation for mission execution. Effectively used software applications to plot targets and set up appropriate communication nodes. Effectively coordinated with crewmembers and mission partners (e.g. tasking sources, supported unit and processing exploitation and dissemination (PED) nodes). Applied IPOE; selected and retrieved relevant planning materials and resources based on the tasking and essential elements of information (EEI).
Q-	Committed minor errors, omissions or deviations, which detracted from effective workstation use but did not jeopardize mission accomplishment. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Failed to initialize and configure intelligence workstation for mission execution. Committed errors, omissions or deviations that jeopardized mission accomplishment. Failed to communicate with PED nodes. Selected extraneous or irrelevant planning materials and resources.
MISSION RESOURCE UTILIZATION	
Q	Accessed/retrieved all correct/applicable products (e.g. ATO/ACO/SPINS, RSTA Annex, JTAR, ACP, ISR target deck and ISR 8-Line) and any changes. Correctly extracted mission tasking, airspace control measures and other information relevant to unit or tasking and communicated to other crewmembers and to mission partners as appropriate. Accurately plotted data required to prepare the mission crew for immediate tasking. Used correct classification and security markings.
Q-	Committed some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed some assistance.
U	Committed errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that jeopardized mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Used incorrect classification and security markings.

SITUATION DISPLAYS	
Q	Researched and analyzed data for accuracy, inconsistencies, and relevance to the situation. Accurately posted target locations, reference points, and maintained OB. All threats/items posted within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates. Plotted to appropriate level of detail with respect to unit requirements. Successfully downloaded, printed, exported and displayed data. Demonstrated ability to convert various coordinate formats. Produced accurate situational awareness overlay. Accurately maintained situation display to unit specifications, including classification and currency. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	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. Needed little assistance with coordinate conversions.
U	Errors significantly impacted mission success. Unable to identify errors or inconsistencies in data. Unable to complete tasks without significant supervision or intervention. Incorrect classification.
AD HOC TASKING PROCEDURES	
Q	Received/processed ad hoc tasking. Appropriately coordinated with applicable mission partners and other crewmembers; assess feasibility of tasking. Extracted and tailored associated EEIs. Demonstrated ability to follow appropriate ad hoc tasking procedures. Followed through with requesting agency to ensure ad hoc tasking was fulfilled.
Q-	Omitted some procedures. Made minor terminology mistakes. Needed to search between 2-3 reasonably likely documents for the primary source on ad hoc tasking procedures but delays had no negative mission impact.
U	Omitted major items, committed major deviations in procedures or failed to find the primary source for ad hoc tasking procedures. Delays and mistakes negatively affected the mission. Neglected to follow through with requesting agency.
SPECIAL PAYLOAD PROCEDURES	
Q	Demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of the capabilities of special payloads carried on the MQ-1&9. Made recommendations that optimized the use of onboard sensors. Followed local procedures.
Q-	Had a limited knowledge of payloads available; did not jeopardize mission success.
U	Demonstrated poor/inadequate knowledge of available payload(s) and/or capabilities. Mistakes and lack of coordination/knowledge led to delays or impacted mission. Failed to follow procedures.
FIND/FIX/TRACK	
Q	Accurately determine target location via metadata and workstation software. Located a target within a search area and employ "target talk-on" techniques with other crewmembers. Provided IPOE products of the target area to the pilot/SO. Identified recognizable target characteristics with tasking unit(s) and/or PED nodes. Adhered to unit standards. Correct classification and security markings on all products.

Q-	Made minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact mission. Slow to determine target location. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Failed to analyze operating environment; errors, omissions or deviations jeopardized mission accomplishment. Did not understand responsibilities with respect to taskings. Poor understanding and/or application of IPOE process. Unable to clearly describe target and surrounding area. Recommended unsafe orbit locations. Did not adhere to unit standards. Incorrect classification and security markings on all products.
SENSOR ISR INTEGRATION/CROSS-CUE	
Q	Correctly executed cross-cueing opportunities with other ISR assets and organizations. Demonstrated proper use of communication channels for retasking opportunities and provided feedback to all applicable mission crew members. Coordinated appropriately with mission partners (e.g. sensor/platform collection authority, appropriate theater ISR control authority and supported unit(s)). Cross-cued own collection with other sensors/platforms to refine operating environment intelligence support. Enhanced other crewmembers' situational awareness of tasked operating environment.
Q-	As above, but committed errors, omissions or deviations which detracted from effective mission execution but did not jeopardize mission accomplishment. Recovered when prompted.
U	Failed to identify/execute cross-cueing opportunities with other ISR assets and organizations. Did not use proper communication channels or coordinate appropriately. Errors, omissions or deviations prevented ISR cross-cue and jeopardized mission accomplishment. Failed to enhance crewmembers' situational awareness of operating environment.
TIME-SENSITIVE REPORTING	
Q	Accurately identified actionable time-sensitive intelligence and/or threats to the MQ-1&9 aircraft and friendly forces as applicable to the mission area. Correctly analyzed impact on the aircraft, mission, other players and mission partners. Reporting was clear and concise and effectively applied local procedures. Reported to all appropriate players and via appropriate methods.
Q-	Minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact MQ-1&9 operations. Able to recover with minimal prompting.
U	Unable to identify or communicate time-sensitive information and/or threats without significant intervention. Unsatisfactory threat knowledge and/or inability to assess threat's capability against MQ-1&9. Alerts were late or not executed. Incorrect security classification.
INTELLIGENCE REPORTS	
Q	Clearly written and disseminated IAW intelligence reporting directives, guidance and policies. Used checklists. Used available software and systems to capture, prepare and disseminate WSV clips and/or images. Clearly understood and complied with local standards and requirements from tasking authority. Used required software and properly formatted. Tailored to target audience. Content correctly summarized all pertinent information

	available, addressed key events and answered EEIs. Quality checked. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality intelligence report. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. Minor errors describing and complying with customer WSV/imagery requirements; recovered when prompted. Minor problems with clarity, organization or formatting, but pertinent information was included.
U	Failed to comply with applicable intelligence reporting directives, guidance and policies. Report was incomplete or inaccurate. Did not use checklists. Writing skills confused meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect format and/or dissemination (e.g. not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). Unable to produce imagery. Did not comply with customer WSV/imagery requirements. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE BRIEFING	
Q	Demonstrated satisfactory knowledge and performance of required briefings. Briefings were professionally delivered, organized, clear and IAW applicable directives. Effective use of checklists/local procedures. Tailored content and classification to audience. Effective use of visual aids. Identified gaps in intelligence with potential impact on the mission. Correctly applied research methods and sources to resolve gaps in intelligence; applied knowledge of MQ-1&9 capabilities and limitations to analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Committed minor errors or omissions. Recovered when prompted, no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Unsatisfactory knowledge and performance of required briefings. Failed to use checklist. Poorly organized, confusing. Did not tailor briefing to mission/audience. Omitted significant information. Significant lack of analysis and ability to conduct basic research. Lacked credibility with poor understanding of MQ-1&9 capabilities or limitations. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
PRE-MISSION SUPPORT	
Q	Gathered all required mission materials; provided target graphics as applicable and available. Applied IPOE to mission target areas. Products were tailored, clear, concise, timely and relevant to mission. Information presented was tailored to mission tasking and MQ-1&9 operations. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact MQ-1&9 operations. Able to recover with minimal prompting.
U	Inability to effectively provide relevant pre-mission and mission support to crew. Information/graphics provided was inadequate, irrelevant or not timely to mission. Information not tailored to tasking or MQ-1&9 capabilities. Incorrect classification.
TDA WORKSTATION UTILIZATION	
Q	Correctly described imagery databases and portals, mensuration software,

	weaponering solutions software, CDE software, and FMV to meet the targeting and mission planning requirements of the unit. Followed unit procedures. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Able to identify databases and software with minimal assistance. Followed unit procedures.
U	Unable to correctly identify databases or software. Failed to use unit procedures. Incorrect classifications.
PAYLOAD AND WEAPONERING	
Q	Demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of the capabilities of weapons carried on the MQ-1&9. Made recommendations that optimized the use of weapons. Followed local procedures.
Q-	Had a limited knowledge of payloads available; did not jeopardize mission success.
U	Demonstrated poor/inadequate knowledge of available weapons and/or capabilities. Mistakes and lack of coordination/knowledge led to delays or impacted mission. Failed to follow procedures.
TARGETING PRODUCTS	
Q	Verified professional, accurate and timely mensurated graphics, models that determine the best weaponering solution, graphics that portrayed potential collateral concerns and accurate BDA. Met the targeting and mission planning requirements of the unit. Applied accurate BDA methodology as required. Followed local procedures. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Verified products with minor errors or omissions. Did not jeopardize or impact mission. Corrected errors with minimal assistance. Followed local procedures.
U	Product verification was inaccurate. Required excessive time to verify products, which affected the mission. Did not follow procedures. Incorrect classification and security markings on products.

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. Mission Intelligence Coordinator Evaluation Criteria.

DISTRIBUTED MISSION CREW COMMUNICATION	
Q	Verified all crewmembers understand mission tasking. Ensured situational awareness was maintained; recognized when loss occurred and acted to correct it. Demonstrated respect for other crewmembers and encourage coordination among crew. Communicated in a clear, concise and efficient manner. Listened to communications from others and give constructive feedback. Prioritized tasks, created timelines. Accurately identified and assessed problems.
Q-	Ensured situational awareness was maintained; but did not immediately recognize when loss occurred or act to correct it. Communication with the crew was sometimes unclear. Slow to prioritize tasks, timelines slightly off. Able to correct with minimal assistance.

U	All crewmembers did not understand mission tasking. Situational awareness was lost and no corrective action taken. Did not respect other crewmembers. Did not communicate effectively. Unable to prioritize tasks and create timelines.
HANDOVER PROCEDURES	
Q	Executed handover according to local standards and checklists. Performed or explained all required procedures, equipment configurations and coordination prior to handover of the mission aircraft according to local checklists and applicable directives. Reported relevant information to other crewmembers and mission partners IAW local procedures and directives and via proper channels.
Q-	Made minor deviations from the checklists and applicable directives regarding procedures, equipment configurations and coordination prior to handover of the mission aircraft. Omitted some or did not obtain all assigned mission documents. Did not negatively impact mission.
U	Omitted major items and committed major deviations in procedures. Delayed mission aircraft getting on target. Negatively affected mission success. Did not use checklists.
TARGET/ENGAGE/ASSESS	
Q	Demonstrate knowledge of the tasking. Supported mission crewmembers by ensuring rules of engagement (ROE) or SPINS requirements were met. Identified and communicate factors that might affect weapons employment or re-attack. Effectively coordinated with external units.
Q-	Required minimal assistance to accomplish tasks. Made minor errors or omissions that did not impact mission success. Able to recover when prompted.
U	Unable to identify and describe unit tasking. No clear understanding of ROE. Did not inform other crewmembers of factors having significant impact on mission success. Did not coordinate effectively with external units.
VIDEO DOWNLINK PROCEDURES	
Q	Effectively coordinated FMV feed in support of operational tasking. Followed local procedures. Ensured FMV feed received. Coordinated frequencies as appropriate. Fixed problems as they emerged.
Q-	Displayed a lack of knowledge and familiarity with FMV system(s) and procedures. Showed some hesitation in coordination but did not jeopardize successful mission execution.
U	Unable to provide FMV feed coordination. Major errors or deviations jeopardized mission success.

Table 3.3. Intelligence Operations Supervisor Evaluation Criteria.

MISSION PREPARATION	
Q	Ensured intelligence personnel were in position, current and qualified, and executed appropriate mission preparation checklists. Ensured all mission players have all items of intelligence value required for maximum situational awareness prior to conducting mission. Ensured all systems are operational

	and, if systems are not operational, coordinated appropriate fixes in a timely manner. Provided crewmembers with required intelligence items. Assisted in mission planning if appropriate.
Q-	Made minor errors but recovered without jeopardizing mission success.
U	Made errors that jeopardized mission success, created unsafe situations, or jeopardized security.
PRODUCT QUALITY CONTROL	
Q	Identified and corrected content and grammatical inaccuracies in MISREPs, crew briefings, intelligence summaries, and other intelligence products as required. Ensured the reports satisfied EEs and were of intelligence value. Provided feedback as necessary to the report writer before and after presenting/disseminating reports and presentations.
Q-	Made minor errors that did not affect overall report accuracy
U	Made errors that resulted or would have resulted in dissemination of inaccurate intelligence
MISSION MANAGEMENT	
Q	Maintained situational awareness of all missions. Communicated with the operations supervisor and crewmembers on intelligence issues. Identified tasking and supported units, working areas, and operational impacts of several simultaneous missions. Responded to scenarios such as mission changes, air asset conflicts, strike events, broken equipment, weather, or communication lapses. Ensured ISR tasking and collection requirements were satisfied.
Q-	Made minor errors that did not jeopardize mission success.
U	Made errors that jeopardized mission success, created unsafe situations, or jeopardized security.
WEAPONS EMPLOYMENT	
Q	Ensured compliance with theater ROE and SPINS as they apply to weapons employment scenarios. Coordinated with the operations supervisor, mission partners and command and control elements as appropriate.
Q-	Made minor errors that did not violate ROE or SPINS.
U	Made errors that jeopardized mission success, created unsafe situations, or jeopardized security.

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.
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 requirements. 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.

ROBERT P. OTTO, Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence,
Surveillance and Reconnaissance

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFI 11-2MQ-1, Volume 2, *MQ-1 Crew Evaluation Criteria*, 28 November 2008

AFI 11-2MQ-9, Volume 2, *MQ-1 Crew Evaluation Criteria*, 15 April 2008

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 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 1, *MQ-1 and 9 Unit Intelligence Training*, 3 April 2014

AFI 14-2MQ-1&9, Volume 3, *MQ-1 and 9 Unit Intelligence Procedures*, 3 April 2014

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

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

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

AFTTP 3.1.MQ-1, *Tactical Employment—MQ-1*, 30 September 2011 (S)

AFTTP 3.1.MQ-9, *Tactical Employment—MQ-9*, 14 December 2012 (S)

AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*, 3 December 2012 (S)

Prescribed Forms

None

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*

AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACC—Air Combat Command

ACO—Airspace Control Order

ACP—Airspace Control Plan

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFTTP—Air Force Tactics, Techniques and Procedures

AOR—Area of Responsibility

ATO—Air Tasking Order

EEI—Essential Elements of Information

FMV—Full Motion Video

IAW—In Accordance With

IE—Intelligence Evaluator

INIT MSN—Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation

IPOE—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment

ISR—Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance

JTAR—Joint Tactical Air Request

MAJCOM—Major Command

MIC—Mission Intelligence Coordinator

MQF—Master Question File

MQT—Mission Qualification Training

MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation

OB—Order of Battle

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

PED—Processing Exploitation and Dissemination

ROE—Rules of Engagement

RSTA—Reconnaissance, Surveillance, and Target Acquisition

SO—Sensor Operator

SPINS—Special Instructions

ST—Specialized Training

TDA—Target Development Analyst

T-2—Tier 2

T-3—Tier 3

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.