

**BY ORDER OF THE
CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU**

**AIR NATIONAL GUARD INSTRUCTION 14-2
BCC VOLUME 2**



4 DECEMBER 2014

Intelligence

**BATTLE CONTROL CENTER UNIT
INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions associated with this publication.

OPR: NGB/A2F

Certified by: NGB/A2
(Col John F. Knabel)

Supersedes: NGBGM14-2V2,
21 February, 2013

Pages: 16

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 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*. This publication establishes the minimum standards for evaluating personnel performing intelligence duties to be used by all Air National Guard assigned or attached personnel in all Battle Control Center units. This publication requires the collection or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974. The applicable Privacy Act system notice is available online at <http://dpclo.defense.gov/Privacy.aspx>. This instruction implements Privacy Act Systems of Records Notice (SORN) F014 AF/A2FMA, Weaponizing Intelligence Combat Capability-Training Documentation System (WICC-TDS). The authority for maintenance of WICC-TDS is 10 U.S.C. 8013, Secretary of the Air Force; 10 U.S.C. 9832, Property Accountability; AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*; AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*; Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*; and Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*; and E.O. 9397 (SSN). Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af61a/afirms/afirms/>. Restrictions expressed in an instruction can be made more, but not less, restrictive by supplement. The provisions of higher-level publications take precedence over lower-level publications. This policy document supports all Air Force Intelligence Training Transformation (IT2) efforts as mandated by DoD and other national policy directives.

Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. Route AF Form 847s through the appropriate functional's chain of command.

Units may request waivers for tiered compliance items IAW AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*. National Guard Bureau (NGB)/A2 is the waiver authority for non-compliance items; these requests must be submitted through the chain-of-command to the publication OPR. In order for units to have time to prepare for compliance, this publication becomes effective 60 days after the publication date.

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. General. This volume provides intelligence evaluators (IEs) 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 in accordance with (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. Applicability. This volume is applicable to all individuals performing intelligence duties in Air National Guard (ANG) Battle Control Center (BCC) units.

1.1.3. Headquarters (HQ) Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (AF/A2) delegates approval authority to the Major Command (MAJCOM)/A2 for MAJCOM authored supplements to this Air National Guard Instruction (ANGI). MAJCOMS will ensure copies are provided to AF/A2, HQ National Guard Bureau A2 and all appropriate MAJCOMS upon publication. Per AFPD 14-2, supplements will not be less restrictive than the lead instruction and should be limited to unique requirements only.

1.2. Waivers. NGB/A2 is the waiver authority for this publication. Submit waivers to NGB/A2. NGB/A2 will courtesy copy AF/A2 and NGB/A3YG on all waiver correspondence and other MAJCOMS as appropriate.

1.2.1. Coordinate T-1 compliance waivers with lead commands to ensure awareness of training issues faced by other MAJCOMS in order to make informed programmatic decisions. See AFI 33-360 for details on compliance waiver requirements.

1.3. Procedures.

1.3.1. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified Intelligence Evaluator (IE), the examinee must have completed all Mission Qualification Training (MQT), and/or Specialized Training (ST) requirements, as outlined in ANGI 14-2BCC, Volume 1, *BCC Unit Intelligence Training*. (T-1)

1.3.1.1. Additionally, the examinee must have on file a satisfactory gradesheet, AF Form 4381 (see Attachment 3 in ANGI 14-2 BCC, Volume 1) from an intelligence evaluator or supervisor for each designated area listed in ANGI 14-2BCC, Volume 1, Attachment 4. The gradesheets will be filed IAW AF/A2 guidance regarding on-line documentation. The gradesheets will be filed in the individual's qualification training record. The IE will use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, to assist in grading the individual areas during the evaluation. Upon completion of the AF Form 4350, the IE may destroy the AF Form 4381s.

1.3.2. IEs will use the evaluation criteria contained in Chapter 3 for conducting all intelligence evaluations. To ensure standard and objective evaluations, IEs will be thoroughly familiar with the prescribed evaluation criteria. (T-1)

1.3.3. 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-1)

1.3.4. Conduct and document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/ Evaluation Program*. Required areas for evaluation are shown in **Table 2.1**. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing, 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 (e.g., 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-1)

1.3.5. 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-2)

1.4. 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. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level. (T-1)

1.4.1. 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. (T-2)

1.4.2. IE judgment must be exercised when the wording for general evaluated areas is subjective and when specific situations are not covered.

1.4.3. General Criteria. The following general grading criteria will be used to grade individual items:

1.4.3.1. Q. Qualified. Performance is correct. Quickly recognizes and corrects errors.

1.4.3.2. Q-. Qualified with discrepancies. Performance indicates limited proficiency. Despite discrepancies/errors, performance does not jeopardize safety or commander's intent during mission execution. Errors of omission or commission are rapidly identified and corrected with minimal impact on mission accomplishment.

1.4.3.3. U. Unqualified. Performance indicates lack of knowledge or ability. Performance could compromise safety or mission accomplishment. Errors of commission or omission were not identified and/or corrected.

1.4.4. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level. IE judgment will be the determining factor in arriving at the overall qualification based on the observed events and tasks IAW this instruction.

1.4.4.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q-1). Performance demonstrates desired knowledge and proficiency. Limited discrepancies resolved in the course of the evaluation.

1.4.4.2. Qualification Level 2 (Q-2). Performance demonstrates ability but some additional training required and/or a grade of unqualified was observed in a task.

1.4.4.3. Qualification Level 3 (Q-3). The member demonstrated an unacceptable level of safety, performance or knowledge. Examinee received an area grade of unqualified in any of the tasks identified by this volume.

1.5. Additional Training. IEs are responsible for recommending additional training at their discretion. Document any additional training and completion IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, as supplemented.

1.6. Unsatisfactory Performance. Examinees receiving an overall “Q-3” qualification will be placed in supervised status until recommended additional training is completed and/or a reevaluation is successfully accomplished. If an examinee receives a “Q-3” on a mission evaluation (INIT MSN or MSN), they may not perform mission duties unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. If an examinee receives a “Q-3” on a specialized evaluation, they may not perform specialized duties until remedial actions are accomplished, but they may perform mission duties unless specifically restricted. (T-1)

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. General. Evaluations must include all required areas as depicted in **Table 2.1**. If it is impossible to accomplish a required area in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local event, the IE may elect to evaluate the area(s) by an alternate method (i.e., staged, simulated, verbally, etc.), in order to complete the evaluation. If the IE determines the required item cannot be adequately evaluated by an alternate method, an additional evaluation will be necessary to complete the requirements.

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluation. A comprehensive knowledge examination will be conducted as part of initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations (INIT MSN/MSN) to determine the examinee's knowledge in the required areas listed in ANGI 14-2BCC, Volume 1, Chapter 3. Evaluations in each knowledge category will be based on the unit's master question file (MQF). Examinations will be recorded on the AF Form 4350 IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Reference **Table 2.1** for required knowledge examinations. (T-1)

2.2.2. Task Evaluation. Units may use evaluation materials provided by MAJCOM/A2 or may assemble evaluation materials themselves using current intelligence, unit tasking and Area of Responsibility (AOR) scenarios that incorporate all appropriate evaluation requirements from **Table 2.1**. Evaluations during exercises or deployments are not prohibited; however, units should apply operational risk management principles to the scheduling of the evaluation. (Real-world contingencies may provide a unique opportunity to conduct an evaluation; however, factors beyond the control of the examinee and IE may preclude its successful completion, and therefore, determination of applicability will be left to the discretion of the Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO)). Guidelines are provided in Chapter 3 to assist in constructing evaluation materials. (T-1)

2.3. Intelligence Evaluator and Evaluations. The IE should be a senior BCC individual who has completed MQT and ST and is thoroughly knowledgeable about their weapon system. Upon completion of MQT and ST qualification profiles an IE for the unit can be designated in writing by the SIO

2.3.1. IE evaluations will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, as supplemented. (T-1)

2.3.2. IEs may conduct subsequent evaluations as part of a periodic mission evaluation. (T-1)

Table 2.1. Items required for Intelligence Evaluation.

SUBJECT	INIT MSN/MSN	MPC	IE
Knowledge Evaluation			
The current situation in theater hot spots.	X		
For ongoing/impending operations: estimated adversary Course of Action (COAs); alternative adversary COAs and reasons for their current priority status.	X		

Collection requirements (CR) and production requirements (PRs) and operations considerations that drive them.	X		
Battle Staff orientation and review the intel Battle Staff products.	X		
Basic theater blue force platform capabilities and limitations.	X		
Battle Control Center organization and chains of command.	X		
NORAD structures and chains of command.	X		
Posse comitatus, Title 10/Title32/Title 50 and how they relate to unit mission.	X		
National and theater collection platforms, sensors available for tasking and processing exploitation and dissemination (PED) architecture.	X		
Intelligence Oversight considerations and Theater-specific Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC) concerns and their impact on Rules of Engagement (ROE)	X		
Key players in the local flow of intelligence.	X		
Force Protection Condition (FPCON), Information Operations Condition (INFOCON), Defense Readiness Condition (DEFCON) and checklists of local procedures for each.	X		
Automated intelligence systems used to support theater intelligence processes.	X		
Theater specific architecture and ROE for posting and reviewing on theater webpage.	X		
Classification guidance and procedures.	X		
Capabilities, limitations and employment of theater communications systems.	X		
Overview of theater estimates development process(es) (including producers and contact info; update times/frequencies; meetings/validation procedures, etc.). Also include Order of Battle (OB), mission reports (MISREPs), intelligence reports (INTREPs), tactical reports (TACREPs), and daily intelligence summaries (DISUMs) data feeds.	X		
Theater procedures and techniques for using sources in functional analytical duties (e.g., websites, chat rooms/sources/feeds used to update the operators)	X		
Knowledge Evaluation (cont.)	INIT MSN/MSN	MPC	IE
Theater criteria for determining whether an intelligence gap warrants an Request for Information (RFI), a PR, or a CR.	X		
Theater TTPs for developing, coordinating, submitting and monitoring RFIs, PRs, and CRs.	X		

Identify and document intelligence gaps and determine most appropriate method for filling the gap (e.g. RFI or CR).	X		
Prepare, process and track RFIs, CRs, or PRs (trainer discretion.)	X		
Theater procedures and techniques for communication (e.g. chat) including process and etiquette.	X		
Intelligence required to support internal customers' (BCC divisions/teams/cells), and their battle rhythms. Intelligence required to support external customers.	X		
Management and dissemination of significant events reporting to include: criteria for definition, correlation requirements for validation, format, suspenses/timelines, documentation and dissemination procedures.	X		
Earliest Probable Arrival Time (EPAT) calculation and plotting; EPAT impact to mission planning	X		
Intelligence support to Ops Changeover Briefing.	X		
Intelligence Changeover briefing (internal to the intel team) to include: Items of interest, password changes, commander's interest items.	X		
Changeover log.	X		
Threats to NORAD-NORTHCOM mission.	X		
Responsible production (RESPROD) agencies for each OB; theater criteria for updates; format and coordination process for update requests; update procedures for OBs for which the BCC has RESPROD.	X		
Checklists for advisory to Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) units of tactical actions and significant events	X		
Current Theater Intelligence Reporting Directives (TIRD) and procedures for coordinating TIRD updates with Air Force Forces (AFFOR).	X		
Required actions during an expansion (e.g. coverage of sister unit's mission during outages).	X		
Checklist for expansion.	X		
Tasks/Products and composition of a mission planning cell. Guidance/Instructions for mission planning process.		X	
Knowledge Evaluation (cont.)	INIT MSN/MSN	MPC	IE
Blue forces capabilities and limitations to prosecute BCC mission.		X	
Techniques and procedures for support to the mission planning cell. Emphasize contrast between addressing short notice threats and prosecuting deliberately planned		X	

operations.			
Be familiar with all evaluation material.			X
Possess all forms/documents required for conducting the evaluation.			X
Comply with all directives pertaining to the administration of the evaluation.			X
Task Evaluation			
Given a scenario and a checklist, take appropriate actions for FPCON, INFOCON, and DEFCON changes.	X		
In a dynamic environment, using theater Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment (IPOE) estimates, analyze available information for deviations from and/or confirmations of projected adversary COA(s).	X		
Using theater significant events criteria, identify, validate, document and disseminate significant events as part of team flight following an unidentified aircraft.	X		
Calculate and plot an EPAT using local system of record.	X		
Create and perform intelligence portion of Ops Changeover Briefing.	X		
Using a checklist, perform intelligence changeover brief.	X		
Using a checklist, perform advisory to ACA units of tactical actions.	X		
Using a checklist, perform required actions during an expansion.	X		
Using theater and unit guidance, given a dynamic scenario, perform mission planning cell tasks within given timeframe.		X	
Brief their examinee on the type(s) of evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, grading criteria, and IE actions/position during the evaluation.			X
Perform the evaluation as briefed during the IE in-brief.			X
Prepare and complete all required documentation and annotate the evaluation IAW AFI 14-202, Vol. 2.			X
Provide a well-organized and accurate debrief.			X

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. General Grading Standards.

3.1.1. The grading criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: Mission Qualification Training and Specialized Training Grading Criteria. Use all sections for criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation.

3.1.2. Where major areas are divided into sub-areas, assign only one grade to the major areas. Annotate discrepancies in sub-areas on the back of the AF Form 4350.

3.1.3. Gradesheets in ANGI 14-2BCC, Volume 1 used by the trainer to document completed training will be used to assist the IE in determining the overall qualification.

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. The paragraph numbers below correspond to Task Training Performance Measures listed in **Table 3.2** of ANGI 14-2 BCC, Volume 1.

Table 3.1. Evaluation Criteria.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answered at least 85% of questions in a test based on the MQF.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
TASK TRAINING EVALUATION	
Trainers and STAN/EVAL teams will use the following criteria to evaluate performance, IAW 14-202, Volume 2	
FPCON, INFOCON, DEFCON changes (1.17)	
Q	Correctly utilized and followed correct checklists. Took appropriate actions. Understood key terms and concepts.
Q-	Recovered when prompted, no significant impact.
U	Could not find checklist. Did not identify appropriate actions. Failed to understand key terms/concepts.
COA Analysis (2.3)	
Q	Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information or changes in scenario that had potential impact on the mission. Showed the ability to discriminate between relevant and 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-	Ideas poorly organized, hard to follow, somewhat redundant, but no impact on mission. Able to recover when prompted.

U	Major omissions that would hamper audience understanding of the situation. Unable to recover, major mission impact. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. 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 on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
Prosecution of Targets of Interest (TOI) (4.5)	
Q	Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information or changes in scenario that had potential impact on the mission. Showed the ability to discriminate between relevant and 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. Adequately demonstrated reporting procedures.
Q-	Ideas poorly organized, hard to follow, somewhat redundant, but no impact on mission. Able to recover when prompted.
U	Major omissions that would hamper audience understanding of the situation. Unable to recover, major mission impact. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. 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 on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
EPAT Calculation (4.6)	
Q	Correctly read TACREP. Correctly utilized and followed checklists. Used appropriate system of record. Derived correct EPAT. Identified discrepancies between sources on Track of Interest (TOI) location. If asked, was able to disseminate or display EPAT appropriately. Updated as required/requested in a timely manner. Derived TACREP information through NORAD approved procedures.
Q-	Recovered when prompted, no significant impact.
U	Could not find checklist. Did not identify appropriate actions. Failed to calculate EPAT. Failed to disseminate or display EPAT even when prompted. Unable to resolve discrepancies between sources on TOI location.
Ops Changeover Briefing (5.4)	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Covered all applicable items. Effective use of visual aids. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed the ability to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information. Understood and provided detailed information tailored to the audience. Demonstrated understanding of unit mission and limitations when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Demonstrated understanding of adversary COAs and capabilities/limitations. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.

Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	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 to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of adversary and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
Intel Changeover Briefing (5.5)	
Q	Well planned, appropriate checklist usage, addressed relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls to pass on to next shift. Showed the ability to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information. Quickly identified significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. 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	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 to proper audience. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
ACA Unit Coordination (7.3)	
Q	Correctly utilized and followed correct checklists. Provided information in a logical sequence. Covered all applicable items. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed the ability to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of ACA unit location and limitations. Fielded questions correctly. Demonstrated understanding of adversary COAs and capabilities/limitations. Correct classification and security procedures followed.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Poorly organized, not tailored. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of ACA unit location and limitations. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of adversary and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
Expansion (8.3)	
Q	Correctly utilized, well executed, appropriate checklist usage. Provided information in a logical sequence, covered all applicable items, addressed relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls. Showed the ability to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information. Quickly identified

	significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Demonstrated understanding of sister BCC units and ACA units' location and limitations. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security procedures followed.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Inadequate checklist usage. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of sister BCC unit and/or ACA units location and limitations. Inability to recover even with minor prompting. Omissions would have affected mission execution. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Fabricated information. 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. The paragraph number below corresponds to the Task Training Performance Measures listed in **Table 3.3** of ANGI 14-2 BCC, Volume 1.

Table 3.2. Specialized Evaluation Criteria.

Mission Planning Cell (MPC) (9.4)	
Q	Demonstrated clear understanding and proper use of mission planning materials. Knew proper channels for requesting information or materials. Accurate portrayal of target of interest. Provided all mission materials in sufficient detail and in timely manner. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment.
Q-	Errors or minor omissions in mission materials which would not preclude mission accomplishment. Minor problems in organizing mission materials. Corrected when prompted. Lack of efficiency but with no impact to mission accomplishment.
U	Major omissions or errors which would have impacted mission. Poor understanding of adversary/blue capabilities and limitations. Lack of understanding of mission requirements or sources for mission materials. Incorrectly plotted target of interest or threats. Did not know how to request information or coordinate appropriately with MPC members or other key players (e.g. FAA). Security or classification errors. Slow performance impacted Mission Planning process.

Table 3.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria –Intelligence Evaluation.

Intelligence Evaluation (10.4 to 10.7)	
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.

STANLEY E. CLARKE III, Lieutenant General,
USAF
Director, Air National Guard

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

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 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013
AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*, 15 September 2010
AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007

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
ADS—Air Defense Sector
AF—Air Force
AFFOR—Air Force Forces
AFI—Air Force Instruction
AFMAN—Air Force Manual
AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive
ANG—Air National Guard
ANGI—Air National Guard Instruction
AOR—Area of Responsibility
BCC—Battle Control Center
CMR—Combat Mission Ready
COA—Course of Action
CR—Collection Requirement
CT—Continuation Training
DEFCON—Defense Readiness Condition
DISUM—Daily Intelligence Summary

EPAT—Earliest Probable Arrival Time
FPCON—Force Protection Condition
HQ—Headquarters
IE—Intelligence Evaluator
INFOCON—Information Operations Condition
INIT MSN—initial mission qualification evaluation
INTREP—Intelligence Report
IPOE—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment
IT2—Intelligence Training Transformation
LOAC—Law of Armed Conflict
MAJCOM—Major Command
MQF—Master Question File
MQT—Mission Qualification Training
MSN—periodic mission qualification evaluations
NBMC—Non-Basic Mission Capable
NGBGM—National Guard Bureau Guidance Memorandum
N-NC—NORAD-NORTHCOM
OB—Order of Battle
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PED—Processing Exploitation and Dissemination
POC—Point of Contact
PR—Production Requirement
RESPROD—Responsible Production
RFI—Request for Information
RIP—Ready Intelligence Program
ROE—Rules of Engagement
SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer
TACREP—Tactical Report
TIRD—Theater Intelligence Reporting Directive
TOI—Targets of Interest
WICC-TDS—Weaponizing Intelligence Combat Capability-Training Documentation System