

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER  
AIR COMBAT COMMAND**

**AIR COMBAT COMMAND  
INSTRUCTION 17-202, VOLUME 2**



**12 JANUARY 2021**

*Incorporating Change 1, 10 MARCH 2023*

*Certified Current, 10 MARCH 2023*

**Cyberspace**

**CYBERCREW  
STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION  
PROGRAM**

**COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY**

---

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

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

---

OPR: USAF/ACC/A3TV

Certified by: ACC/A3T  
(John F. Costa, GS-14, DAF)

Supersedes: ACCI17-202V2, 8 OCTOBER 2019

Pages: 74

---

This instruction implements DAFPD 17-2, *Cyberspace Warfare Operations*. This instruction establishes the Cybercrew Standardization/Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Program that supports AF objectives and provides guidance on how to structure and monitor a Stan/Eval program. This publication applies to all Air Combat Command (ACC), Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC), Air National Guard (ANG), and third-party governmental and contract support agencies IAW appropriate provisions contained in memoranda, support agreements and AF contracts. Refer to weapon system volumes (e.g., ACCMAN 17-2CVAHV2) for specific Stan/Eval requirements unique to individual and cybercrew positions. This publication requires the collection and or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by DoD 5400.11-R, *Department of Defense Privacy Program*. The applicable System of Records Notice F011 AF AFMC B, *Patriot Excalibur (PEX) System Records*, applies and is available at <https://dpcl.d.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNsIndex/DOD-Component-Notices/Air-Force-Article-List/>; SORN OPM/GOVT-1, *General Personnel Records*, applies and is available at <https://dpcl.d.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNsIndex/Government-Wide-Notices.aspx>. Vigilance must be taken to protect Personally Identifiable Information when submitting or sending nominations, applications or other documents to DoD agencies through government Internet, software applications, systems, e-mail, postal, faxing or scanning. Refer to AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*, for additional guidance. Forms containing Personally Identifiable Information require Privacy Act Statements. Ensure all records generated as a result

of processes prescribed in this publication adhere to AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and are disposed in IAW the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule, which is located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. Submit suggested improvements to this instruction on DAF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, through Stan/Eval channels, to ACC Standardization and Evaluation Branch (ACC/A3TV), [accdotsrtb@us.af.mil](mailto:accdotsrtb@us.af.mil). This publication may be supplemented at any level, but all supplements must be routed to the OPR of this publication for coordination prior to certification and approval. The authorities to waive wing or unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier (“T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3”) number following the compliance statement. Waiver authority for non-tiered paragraphs remains with ACC Director of Operations (ACC/A3). Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority, or alternately, to the requestor’s commander for non-tiered compliance items. The use of the name or mark of any specific manufacturer, commercial product, commodity, or service in this publication does not imply endorsement by the DAF.

### ***SUMMARY OF CHANGES***

This Interim change revises ACCI 17-202V2 by providing consideration for alternative software solutions used to document cybercrew standardization and evaluation records. In addition, changes to allow the transition from Patriot Excalibur (PEX) to USCYBERCOMMAND software alternative(s) as directed; References to the rescinded DAFI 33-360 were removed; Air Force Reserve Command Standardization and Evaluations Division (AFRC/A3V), transferred all Stan/Eval functions to Air Force Reserve Command Information Warfare Branch (AFRC/A3OI) and 10 AF/A3V; and the term For Official Use Only was replaced by Controlled Unclassified Information.

<b>Chapter 1—PURPOSE</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. General.....	5
1.2. Objectives. ....	5
<b>Chapter 2—MAJCOM COMMAND (MAJCOM) STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Scope.....	6
2.2. ACC Standardization and Evaluation Branch (ACC/A3TV) Functions.....	6
2.3. NAFs.....	7
2.4. Stan/Eval Visits (SAVs). ....	8
2.5. The HHQ ESAP.....	8
<b>Chapter 3—UNIT STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1. Scope.....	11
3.2. Operations Group.....	11
Table 3.1. Pyramid Evaluation Structure. ....	14

3.3. Squadron.....	14
<b>Chapter 4—CYBERCREW STAN/EVAL EXAMINERS (SEE)</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1. General.....	16
4.2. Selection: .....	16
4.3. Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE) Functions.....	16
4.4. Senior SEE Program.....	16
<b>Chapter 5—CYBERCREW EVALUATIONS</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1. General.....	18
5.2. Categories. ....	18
5.3. Grading System.....	21
5.4. Evaluation Criteria.....	24
5.5. Requisites.....	24
5.6. Failure to Pass a Performance Evaluation.....	26
5.7. Supervised Status.....	27
5.8. Timing of Cyber Qualification Evaluations.....	27
5.9. Commander-Directed Downgrade.....	28
5.10. Multiple Qualification.....	29
5.11. Cybercrew Operating in Non-USAF Weapon Systems and with Non-USAF Units.....	29
5.12. Initial Cadre.....	30
<b>Chapter 6—CYBERCREW EXAMINATION PROGRAM</b>	<b>31</b>
6.1. Purpose.....	31
6.2. Scope.....	31
6.3. Administrative Procedures.....	31
6.4. Written Exam Sources.....	31
6.5. End-of-Course Exams.....	32
6.6. Exam Management.....	32
6.7. Exam Security.....	32
6.8. Grading.....	33
6.9. Failure to Pass a Requisite Examination.....	33
6.10. Unit Periodic Examinations (Optional).....	33

<b>Chapter 7—ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS (CIF, SPECIAL INTEREST ITEM (SII), GO/NO-GO, SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATIONS)</b>	<b>34</b>
7.1. CIF.....	34
Table 7.1. Required Volumes.....	35
Table 7.2. Volume II Mandatory Publications.....	36
7.2. Operations Related SII.....	36
7.3. Go/No-Go Procedures.....	37
7.4. Supplementary Evaluations.....	37
<b>Chapter 8—DOCUMENTATION</b>	<b>39</b>
8.1. Scope.....	39
8.2. Qualifications versus Certifications.....	39
8.3. ACC Form 4418, Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification.....	39
8.4. Commander-Directed Downgrade.....	47
8.5. Initial Cadre.....	49
8.6. ACC Form 4420, Individual’s Record of Duties and Qualifications.....	50
8.7. CEF.....	51
<b>Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Attachment 2—STAN/EVAL BOARD MINUTES</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Attachment 3—ACC FORM 4418</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Attachment 4—CIF TEMPLATE</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Attachment 5—EXAMINER OBJECTIVITY EVALUATION GRADING CRITERIA</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Attachment 6—SAMPLE ESAP REPORT</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Attachment 7—BRIEFING FACILITIES GUIDANCE</b>	<b>74</b>

## Chapter 1

### PURPOSE

**1.1. General.** The purpose of the Cybercrew Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) program is to provide commanders a tool to validate readiness and the effectiveness of unit operations, including documentation of individual member qualifications and certifications.

1.1.1. This instruction applies to cybercrew members, defined as individuals who conduct cyberspace operations and are assigned to a specific cyberspace weapon system and position, including those who are augmenting standard weapon system units. Specific cybercrew positions for a given cyberspace weapon system may be found in the applicable weapon system policy. This instruction also applies to members in formal training for immediate assignment to a cyberspace weapon system position.

1.1.2. This document uses the shorthand ACCMAN17-2(MDS) for the cyberspace weapon system manuals.

### 1.2. Objectives.

1.2.1. Provide a system to assess and document individual cybercrew proficiency and capability to accomplish assigned cyberspace operations duties.

1.2.2. Develop and ensure standardization of operational procedures for weapon system employment.

1.2.3. Ensure compliance with appropriate operational, training, and administrative directives.

1.2.4. Evaluate and revise operational directives, procedures, and techniques as necessary.

1.2.5. Recognize trends in order to recommend/initiate changes to training programs and directives.

## Chapter 2

### MAJCOM COMMAND (MAJCOM) STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION

**2.1. Scope.** For the purposes of this instruction MAJCOM includes MAJCOM and Numbered Air Force (NAF) Stan/Eval functions.

2.1.1. Direct reporting units (DRUs) and the National Guard Bureau (NGB) are considered MAJCOMs for purposes of this instruction.

#### **2.2. ACC Standardization and Evaluation Branch (ACC/A3TV) Functions**

2.2.1. Set policy and guide the conduct and execution of the Stan/Eval program.

2.2.2. Primarily responsible for establishing administrative processes. Lower echelons of command are primarily responsible for the cyberspace operations and evaluation functions.

2.2.3. Review and maintain this instruction.

2.2.4. Coordinate with the applicable MAJCOM Functional Area Managers (FAM) on the development and management of all Mission Design Series (MDS) policy documents. The MAJCOM FAM will determine policy precedence for MDS-specific policy guidance, in coordination with the other publication OPRs.

2.2.5. Review supplements to this publication to ensure compliance with basic policy guidance in this instruction.

2.2.6. Maintain liaison with other MAJCOMs and cyber career-field professionals to ensure United States Air Force (USAF) enterprise-wide compliance by all ACC personnel.

2.2.7. Coordinate on and process applicable AF Form 847 submissions through Stan/Eval channels, to include Operations Group Stan/Eval (OGV), NAF (if applicable), and MAJCOM. ANG units will utilize the NAF or MAJCOM command structure with oversight responsibility.

2.2.8. ACC Stan/Eval may perform missions to maintain current and qualified expertise.

2.2.9. Provide staff coordination and control of all Cybercrew Information File (CIF) items issued from the MAJCOM level to units (see [Chapter 8](#)).

2.2.10. Establish guidance for MAJCOM-mandated Stan/Eval software.

2.2.10.1. Ensures units utilize PEX or USCYBERCOMMAND-defined Stan/Eval software alternative. Units will utilize PEX until USCYBERCOMMAND directs transition to alternative software. Further reference to PEX in this document applies to USCYBERCOMMAND-defined alternative(s), as applicable. **(T-2)**

2.2.11. Assist units and agencies in evaluation of operational mishaps (i.e., Operational Review Board), as requested.

2.2.12. In the absence of a NAF Stan/Eval function, assume responsibilities listed in [paragraph 2.4](#).

2.2.13. Observe and/or augment subordinate NAF Stan/Eval visits when feasible.

2.2.14. Observe execution of unit missions and provide feedback when feasible.

2.2.15. Provide functional area compliance inspection guidance to MAJCOM/Inspector General (IG) in support of IG inspections.

2.2.16. MAJCOM Stan/Eval staff will consist of a chief and one cybercrew member per crew position per MDS, or as directed by MAJCOM/A3s.

2.2.16.1. MAJCOM/NAF examiners may receive their evaluations from any like-qualified cybercrew examiner in the same crew position.

2.2.17. Coordinate with appropriate agencies to develop the cybercrew Stan/Eval Self-Assessment Checklist (SAC) as specified in AFI90-201, *The Air Force Inspection System*. IAW AFI90-201, ACCSUP, uploads the SAC in the Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT).

2.2.18. Assist with the review, updating and distribution of Master Question Files (MQFs) (See [Chapter 6](#)).

2.2.19. Convene conferences and working groups, as necessary, to review and improve command Stan/Eval policies and procedures

2.2.20. Plan and Execute the Higher Headquarters (HHQ) Evaluation Standardization Assessment Program (ESAP).

2.2.21. Support the ACC Inspector General (ACC/IG) as a representative of ACC Stan/Eval Chief in execution of the inspection programs IAW AFI 90-201 and applicable supplements.

2.2.22. Coordinate on operational procedures, evaluation criteria and guidance.

### 2.3. NAFs.

2.3.1. Scope. NAF Stan/Eval will maintain a tactical focus and perform the operational role in evaluating unit Stan/Eval functions within its chain of command.

2.3.2. Functions.

2.3.2.1. Maintain oversight of Stan/Eval functions in lower echelon units, in gained units, and in AFRC and ANG units for which oversight responsibility is assigned.

2.3.2.2. Conduct Stan/Eval visits IAW MAJCOM directives. Coordinate with MAJCOM Stan/Eval and/or MAJCOM/IG functions to schedule visits.

2.3.2.3. Coordinate on and process applicable AF Form 847 submissions through Stan/Eval channels. ANG units will utilize the NAF/MAJCOM command structure with oversight responsibility, and notify NGB/A3.

2.3.2.4. Provide staff coordination and control of all CIF items issued from the NAF level to units (see [Chapter 8](#)).

2.3.2.5. Provide qualified Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE) to augment other MAJCOM and NAF agencies when requested.

2.3.2.6. Administer periodic crew evaluations, when practical, to Chiefs of Stan/Eval or senior Stan/Eval crews in lower echelon units, in gained units, and in AFRC and ANG units for which oversight responsibility is assigned.

2.3.2.7. Observe execution of unit missions and provide feedback when feasible.

2.3.2.8. Review and coordinate on subordinate unit supplements to this instruction.

2.3.2.8.1. Unit supplements will be reviewed and returned to units with comments within 60 days of submission. To ensure adequate time for review and implementation, units should submit supplements at least 7 months before a scheduled ESAP. If units submit their supplement less than 3 months before a scheduled ESAP, the NAF may complete the review during the scheduled ESAP.

2.3.2.9. Review subordinate unit Stan/Eval Board (SEB) minutes and, at a minimum, address any action items requiring HHQ assistance.

2.3.2.9.1. Initiate corrective action to eliminate noted discrepancies or deficiencies when HHQ action is required. Ensure unit corrective actions are satisfactory.

2.3.2.10. Review, coordinate, and distribute applicable MAJCOM-provided guidance.

2.3.2.11. Coordinate and ensure oversight of the unit trend analysis program.

2.3.2.12. Provide staff coordination and perform distribution actions on all Crew Information File (CIF) items issued from the MAJCOM level to units.

2.3.2.13. Assist ACC/A3TV with the review, updating and distribution of MDS-specific MQFs.

2.3.2.14. Administer periodic crewmember or objectivity evaluations, when practical, to Chiefs of Stan/Eval or senior Stan/Eval crewmembers in lower echelon units and in ANG and AFR units.

2.3.3. Organization. Typical NAF Stan/Eval staff includes a chief and one examiner per crew position per MDS. Manning may be adjusted by the NAF Commander.

2.3.4. Augmentation. Each NAF may use qualified augmentees to support or conduct reviews, evaluations, and inspections with concurrence of all the NAF Stan/Eval organizations involved.

**2.4. Stan/Eval Visits (SAVs).** HHQ Stan/Eval staffs may visit units during the administration of formal inspections, Staff Assistance Visits (SAVs) that were requested by the commander, or in an informal capacity. Formal unit visits will be coordinated and scheduled with the MAJCOM Gatekeeper IAW AFI90-201.

2.4.1. Each ACC NAF may use augmentees from other ACC NAFs to support or conduct SAVs, cybercrew evaluations, or ACC ESAP visits.

2.4.2. The Chief of NAF Stan/Eval will identify in writing, NAF HHQ assigned Stan/Eval examiners and provide ACC/A3TV with a copy of the most current examiner document. (T-2).

## **2.5. The HHQ ESAP.**

2.5.1. HHQ ESAP Description:

2.5.1.1. The HHQ ESAP consists of a series of cybercrew evaluations performed by HHQ Examiners. The intent of the program is to ensure that the unit cybercrew evaluation system is providing accurate assessment information to the unit commander regarding the qualification of the unit's cybercrew. The program assesses the capability of the unit's



examiners to make accurate objective decisions and consistent subjective decisions during unit cybercrew evaluations. The program evaluates the examiners ability to construct and execute a thorough and fair evaluation. The program also assesses the consistency of the evaluation results by comparing Qualification Levels and numbers/types of downgrades issued during the HHQ ESAP visit(s), with Qualification Levels and downgrades issued during the current IG inspection cycle.

2.5.1.2. The evaluations are conducted IAW this publication, ACCMAN 17-2MDS Vol 2, the unit's Designed Operational Capability (DOC) statement and associated publications. Unit Stan/Eval administrative programs are inspected separately under AFI90-201, Attachment 3.

2.5.1.3. The HHQ ESAP is part of the IG inspection cycle. The results are reported to the ACC/IG and may be included in the wing's final Unit Effectiveness Inspection (UEI) report. The HHQ ESAP may be completed in one visit, or in multiple visits, depending on the unit's schedule and availability of HHQ evaluators. The timing of the ESAP visit(s) may be aligned with any UEI on-site inspection, or conducted as stand-alone HHQ Stan/Eval visits, but should be completed before the end of the Capstone visit to ensure the results are incorporated into the wing's final IG report.

2.5.1.4. The ESAP visit schedule is coordinated between NAF Stan/Eval, MAJCOM Stan/Eval offices and the unit's OGV office based on the unit's schedule and HHQ evaluator availability. ACC Stan/Eval office then provides the final ESAP visit schedule to ACC/IG Gatekeeper. HHQ evaluators are primarily sourced from HQ/ACC and aligned NAF Stan/Eval offices. If not available, HQ/ACC and NAF Stan/Eval may source HHQ evaluators from MAJCOMs (with ACC/A3TV coordination), NAFs and/or Wings. As a last resort, HHQ evaluators may be sourced from the inspected unit.

2.5.1.4.1. All ESAP HHQ examiners that are not assigned to the MAJCOM or NAF Stan/Eval Offices are identified on a temporary HHQ examiner letter for the period identified for the ESAP event. The temporary letter requires a memorandum signed by the Chief of ACC Stan/Eval.

2.5.1.5. HHQ examiners are not required to obtain or generate a memorandum of agreement between the HHQ Stan/Eval Office and the host OG Commander (OG/CC) when conducting evaluations as part of a HHQ ESAP visit.

2.5.1.6. HHQ ESAP Team Composition and responsibilities.

2.5.1.6.1. HHQ ESAP Visiting Team Lead and responsibilities.

2.5.1.6.2. The Visiting Team Lead for subordinate unit ESAP events is a NAF identified examiner, appointed by the NAF or MAJCOM Chief of Stan/Eval. The Team Lead acts as the primary liaison between the identified unit OGV and ACC Stan/Eval to coordinate event functions, garner MAJCOM perspective, and manage the ESAP event.

2.5.1.6.3. Further procedures for planning and developing ESAP visits can be found in the ACC Examiner Guide.

2.5.1.6.4. HHQ ESAP examiners duties and responsibilities are found in the ACC Examiner Guide.

2.5.1.6.5. Unit receiving the ESAP visit responsibilities.

2.5.1.6.5.1. Upon notification or when initiating the planning of the ESAP visit, OGV designates a local coordinator to establish the schedule, determine the objectives of the ESAP visit and act as a representative of the OG/CC. Further guidance can be found by contacting the Visiting Coordinator or NAF Stan/Eval function.

2.5.1.6.6. HHQ ESAP Goals:

2.5.1.6.6.1. Accomplish Examiner Objectivity SPOT Evaluations on 75% of the unit's examiners.

2.5.1.6.7. Accomplish Qualification (QUAL)/Mission (MSN)/Emergency Procedures Examination (EPE) evaluations on 15% of the unit's cybercrew. This percentage is accomplished by two means:

2.5.1.6.7.1. Direct evaluations by HHQ Examiners.

2.5.1.6.7.2. Direct crew position evaluations administered by unit Examiners receiving an objectivity SPOT evaluation as administered by an HHQ Examiner, where the results in the objectivity evaluation grade was Q1 or Q2.

2.5.1.6.8. Cybercrew Evaluations should contain an even sampling of QUAL/MSN/EPE evaluations. The exact composition of evaluation types is decided by the ESAP visit team lead and coordinated with the unit chief of Stan/Eval.

2.5.1.6.9. HHQ ESAP Reporting:

2.5.1.6.9.1. The ESAP visit Team Chief reports the results to the unit commander using the format in **Attachment 6** as an unclassified marked document. Copies should be sent to the inspected Wing (WG)/CC, WG/IG, OG/CC, SQ/CC, Squadron Standardization and Evaluations (SQ/CCV) NAF/A3, NAF/A3V, ACC/A3, ACC Flight Operations Division (ACC/A3T) and ACC/A3TV no later than 2 weeks after each ESAP visit. ACC/A3TV submits the report to ACC/IG for inclusion in the wing's UEI report. If the ESAP visit is executed at the same time as the UEI Capstone Visit, the ESAP visit report should be submitted to the ACC/IG in time to be included in the inspected wing's UEI final report.

2.5.1.6.10. Superior performers may be recognized on the ESAP report at the discretion of the ESAP visit team chief.

2.5.1.6.11. A template for the ESAP visit report can be found at the ACC/A3TV SharePoint® Site at <https://usaf.dps.mil/sites/ACC-A3/A3T/A3TV/SitePages/Home.aspx>.

2.5.1.6.12. Include the following statement as the first line in the comments section on the ACC Form 4418: "This evaluation was administered as part of the HHQ Evaluation Standardization Assessment Program."

## Chapter 3

### UNIT STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION

**3.1. Scope.** For purposes of this instruction, "unit" includes levels of organization under HHQ required to establish a Stan/Eval function. Most units are composed of an OG and cyber squadrons/detachments (henceforth in this publication, "OG" will be considered any group-level command, and "squadron" is used synonymously with "detachment"). Where there is no parent OG, squadrons will assume duties listed for OGs.

**3.2. Operations Group.** The conduct of the unit level Stan/Eval program is directed by the OG/CC. Air National Guard OG/CCs may delegate this function to squadron Stan/Eval functions as mission and manning dictate IAW [paragraph 3.2.2.5](#).

#### 3.2.1. OG/CC Responsibilities.

3.2.1.1. Provide manpower to the unit Stan/Eval function to execute the duties directed by this publication. **(T-3)**.

3.2.1.2. Direct supplementary evaluations (see [Chapter 7](#)).

3.2.1.2.1. Supplementary Evaluations will be as directed by unit supplements.

3.2.1.3. Chair the SEB.

3.2.1.3.1. Board members will include Chief of Stan/Eval, Chief of Training, Chief of Weapons and Tactics, and all available SEEs.

3.2.1.3.2. At a minimum, the board should address:

3.2.1.3.2.1. Stan/Eval manning levels.

3.2.1.3.2.2. A summary of all evaluations, examinations, and Waivers and Extensions since the last board and any trends identified.

3.2.1.3.2.3. Stan/Eval Program Inspections and Reviews since the last board.

3.2.1.3.2.4. Pending or completed Stan/Eval related publication changes.

3.2.1.3.2.5. Results of evaluations conducted at both the OGV and squadron level.

3.2.1.3.2.6. Old Business including open or completed business items since the last board.

3.2.1.3.2.7. New Business.

3.2.1.3.2.8. Items requiring HHQ assistance.

3.2.1.4. Establish procedures to implement MAJCOM-mandated Stan/Eval software.

3.2.1.5. Determine delegation of Group's Stan/Eval functions for organizations not collocated with the Group.

3.2.1.6. Designate and certify OG Stan/Eval cybercrew examiners.

3.2.1.7. Select SEE from the most highly qualified and experienced instructors (**Exception:** Senior SEE, see [paragraph 4.4](#)).

- 3.2.1.8. Approve the update of MDS-specific MQFs.
- 3.2.1.9. Provide a suitable facility and resources to accommodate the Stan/Eval function.
- 3.2.1.10. Provide the means to procure the necessary materials for mission planning, pre-mission briefings, and supervision.
- 3.2.1.11. Ensure adequate cybercrew briefing facilities are provided at the unit level, **Attachment 7** contains guidance for the minimum mission planning materials required to conduct an adequate cybercrew briefing.
- 3.2.1.12. OG/CCs of an integrated total-force structure, will address the relationship between the active and reserve component Stan/Eval organizations via a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and/or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) IAW AFI90-1001, *Total Force Associations (TFAS)*.

- 3.2.1.12.1. The MOA will address cross-component evaluation procedures, restrictions, and administrative and operational control relationships.

- 3.2.1.12.2. The MOA will address the routing process for ACC Form 4418, specifically who will sign as Reviewing Official and Final Approving Officer.

3.2.2. OGV Organization. OGV staff will consist of a Chief of Stan/Eval and will include at least one examiner per crew position per MDS. Manning and organization may be adjusted IAW MAJCOM instructions or with OG/CC approval.

- 3.2.2.1. The Chief of Stan/Eval will be a certified examiner in a unit assigned weapon system. For units undergoing conversion, the Chief of Stan/Eval may be qualified in the weapon system to which the unit is converting, even if none are yet assigned.

- 3.2.2.2. The Chief of Stan/Eval will report directly to, and be rated by, the OG/CC. For units not collocated with the parent wing/group, the Chief of Stan/Eval will report directly to and be rated by the unit commander, or as specified by MAJCOM instruction.

- 3.2.2.3. The OG/CC may designate additional OGV SEEs who are not assigned to OGV when necessary to meet unique unit requirements. Document in the SEB minutes (see **Attachment 2**).

- 3.2.2.4. The OG/CC may designate Stan/Eval Liaison Officers (SELOs) to assist OGV in administrative duties.

- 3.2.2.5. At the discretion of the OG/CC, OGV and squadron Stan/Eval functions may be combined.

- 3.2.2.6. Review, update and distribute MDS-specific MQFs. May be delegated to the Squadron Stan/Eval.

3.2.3. OGV Functions.

- 3.2.3.1. At the OGV level, emphasis is on overall unit standardization. Under direction of the Chief of OGV, examiners will ensure standardization throughout squadron Stan/Eval functions and squadron-assigned examiners.

- 3.2.3.2. Oversees development. Establish procedures for review and quality control of ACC Form 4418.

3.2.3.3. Establish procedures to maintain and review unit Cybercrew Evaluation Folders (CEFs). If not maintained by the squadron Stan/Eval function, maintain unit CEFs.

3.2.3.4. Establish procedures for requisite Cybercrew Examinations (see [Chapter 6](#)).

3.2.3.4.1. Approved MQFs will be provided to ACC/A3TV.

3.2.3.5. Establish and maintain a trend program. The scope should include, but not be limited to, trend analysis of all evaluations. For units with more than one type of MDS and/or crew position, combine discrepancies common to all MDSs/crew positions to determine trends.

3.2.3.5.1. For units conducting formal training, maintain separate trend data for students and instructors.

3.2.3.5.2. When trends are noted, OGV will accomplish the following:

3.2.3.5.2.1. Recommend an Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) and Office of Collateral Responsibility (OCR). **(T2)**.

3.2.3.5.2.2. Recommend corrective action and a method to verify that this trend has been corrected.

3.2.3.5.2.3. Ensure the trend is closed when corrective action is successfully implemented and verified by the OPR/OCR.

3.2.3.5.2.4. Report trends and status to the OG/CC during the SEB until closed (see [Attachment 2](#)).

3.2.3.6. Conduct supplementary evaluations as directed by the OG/CC. (see [paragraph 7.4](#)).

3.2.3.7. Conduct SEBs and document IAW [Attachment 2](#) and MAJCOM instruction.

3.2.3.7.1. At a minimum, SEBs will be held semiannually and as early as practical after the end of the previous 6-month period. SEB minutes will be kept on file until the next ESAP.

3.2.3.7.2. Attendees should include squadron commanders and OGV/squadron examiners. Absent SEB members will read SEB minutes.

3.2.3.7.3. Send a copy of the SEB minutes to the following: ACC/A3TV, Active Duty Units (except Primary Reporting Units (PRUs) and DRUs), NAF/OV/A3V. AFRC Units, AFRC/A3OI, NAF/OV/A3V with oversight responsibility, Tenth Air Force Standardization and Evaluation (10 AF/A3V). ANG Units, NAF/OV/A3V with oversight responsibility and National Guard Bureau Director of Operations (NGB A3/10).

3.2.3.8. Establish and maintain the unit CIF program.

3.2.3.9. Establish unit no-notice program to be utilized at the discretion of the OG/CC or Squadron Commander (SQ/CC). **(T-2)**.

3.2.3.10. Publish a unit supplement of procedures for the implementation of this instruction as needed.

3.2.3.11. Units will administer evaluations in a pyramid style evaluation structure, IAW **Table 3.1**, where higher-level Examiners or Examiner qualified supervisors, evaluate subordinate cybercrew and lower level Examiners, unless authorized otherwise by group commanders. **(T-2)**. This authorization may be granted in the unit supplement, but will be documented in the “Reviewers Comments” section of the ACC Form 4418. **(T-2)**.

**Table 3.1. Pyramid Evaluation Structure.**

<u>Examinee</u>	<u>Examiner</u>
SQ assigned/attached personnel, MAJCOM or NAF Examiners	Any Examiner (IAW para. 3.2.4.)
SQ/Det/CC, DO, Superintendent & SQ Examiner	OGV/NAF/MAJCOM Examiner, or Examiner higher in chain-of-command
OGV Examiner, WG/CC/CV & OG/CC/CD Examiner	NAF or MAJCOM Examiner, or Examiner higher in chain-of-command

3.2.3.11.1. When no qualified Examiner is available above the examinee in the pyramid evaluation structure or chain of command, the next Examiner in the pyramid should administer the evaluation. Exceptions are documented in the additional comments section of the ACC Form 4418.

3.2.3.11.2. Units with examinees requiring NAF or MAJCOM evaluation will contact their HHQ Stan/Eval for availability before the fourth month of the examinee’s eligibility period. **(T-2)**. The HHQ Stan/Eval may delegate if no appropriate Examiner is available

### 3.3. Squadron.

#### 3.3.1. SQ/CC Responsibilities:

3.3.1.1. Ensure a suitable Stan/Eval testing area.

3.3.1.2. Designate squadron cyber SEEs in a Squadron Letter of Certification.

3.3.1.3. May designate SELOs to assist in administrative Stan/Eval duties.

3.3.1.4. Ensure that individuals whose periodic evaluations expire either within three months after their departure for a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) to a operational assignment in the same weapon system, or during an upcoming Temporary Duty (TDY) (operational or non-operational), complete the required evaluation(s) before departing. Coordinate with the gaining OG/CC for any instances where this requirement cannot be met. **Note:** Applies to extended TDY that may preclude the member from completing a required evaluation within the prescribed eligibility period.

3.3.2. Squadron Stan/Eval Functions. The focus of the Stan/Eval program is at the squadron level. Its backbone is the program established by the SQ/CC and administered by SEE embedded within the squadron. Any or all of the following responsibilities may be assumed at a higher level in situations where a squadron Stan/Eval function does not exist, as specified in MAJCOM and/or unit supplements to this instruction. OG supplements outline local guidance

on managing the Stan/Eval function for operational squadrons where a Stan/Eval function does not exist.

3.3.2.1. Manage and conduct cybercrew evaluations and supplemental evaluations IAW published guidance.

3.3.2.2. Implement Stan/Eval cybercrew exam procedures IAW published guidance.

3.3.2.3. Implement OGV CEF maintenance and review guidance.

3.3.2.4. Assist OGV in managing the trend program.

3.3.2.5. Coordinate on and process applicable AF Form 847 through Stan/Eval channels. ANG units will utilize the NAF/MAJCOM command structure with oversight responsibility, and notify NGB/A3.

3.3.2.6. Assist OGV in implementing the weapon system publications program IAW Technical Order (TO) 00-5-1, *The Air Force Technical Order System*, and ensure compliance with the OG CIF program.

3.3.2.7. Ensure proper completion, routing, and filing of approved forms IAW ACCMAN17-2 (MDS).

3.3.2.8. Advise squadron leadership of cybercrew progression toward completion of requisites and performance evaluations.

3.3.2.9. Implement OG guidance on the usage of MAJCOM-mandated Stan/Eval software.

### 3.3.3. Squadron Stan/Eval Organization.

3.3.3.1. The squadron Stan/Eval function will consist of a Chief of Stan/Eval who is a certified examiner in a squadron weapon system and one person for each squadron cybercrew MDS. Each person assigned to the squadron Stan/Eval function must maintain Mission Ready (MR) in their assigned MDS.

3.3.3.1.1. Waiver authority is the OG/CC. Document waivers in SEB minutes (see [Attachment 2](#)).

3.3.3.1.2. For units undergoing conversion, the Chief of Stan/Eval may be qualified in the weapon system to which the unit is converting, even if none of the new weapon systems are yet within the unit.

3.3.3.2. The chief of squadron Stan/Eval will report directly to and be rated by the SQ/CC, or as specified by MAJCOM instruction.

3.3.3.3. The Squadron Stan/Eval Function will consist of a certified examiner in each cybercrew position.



## Chapter 4

### CYBERCREW STAN/EVAL EXAMINERS (SEE)

**4.1. General.** The evaluation portion of the Cybercrew Stan/Eval Program is administered by examiners at the HHQ and unit levels.

**4.2. Selection:**

4.2.1. The chief of the respective MAJCOM or NAF Stan/Eval function will select and designate in writing HHQ examiners. Copies of the designation memo will be sent to all units where HHQ examiners are attached to operate and conduct missions.

4.2.2. The OG/CC and SQ/CC will each select, and designate in writing, all OGV and Squadron SEE (respectively).

4.2.2.1. The OG/CC and SQ/CC may designate additional OGV or squadron SEE (respectively) who are not assigned to OGV or the squadron when necessary to meet unique unit requirements.

4.2.2.2. Annotate all SEE [to include attached and senior SEE (see [paragraph 4.4](#))] in the Squadron Letter of Certification.

**4.3. Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE) Functions.**

4.3.1. Conduct cybercrew evaluations IAW [Chapter 5](#) and document IAW [Chapter 8](#).

4.3.2. Administer evaluations only within their weapon system/cybercrew specialty and only evaluate those mission/skill sets in which they maintain qualification and/or certification. **Exception:** SPOT evaluations and where specifically authorized in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

4.3.2.1. Waiver authority for SEE to evaluate mission/skill sets in which they are not certified is the OG/CC. For senior SEE (see [paragraph 4.4](#)), waiver authority is the next commander in their operational chain of command.

4.3.3. Conduct a thorough pre-mission briefing and post-mission debriefing for the examinee and applicable cybercrew members on all aspects of the evaluation.

4.3.4. Immediately correct breaches of safety or crew discipline during an evaluation (applies to both the examinee as well as any accompanying cybercrew).

4.3.5. As soon as possible, notify the examinee's SQ/CC, Director of Operations, or direct supervisor whenever Qualification Level 2 or 3 (Q2 or Q3) performance is observed (see [paragraph 5.3.3](#)).

4.3.6. If an examiner instructs for at least half of an examinee's training, or recommends a trainee for upgrade, a different Examiner should conduct the evaluation. The examinee's squadron commander may waive this restriction. This waiver is documented in the Remarks Section of the ACC Form 4418 and is reportable in the SEB minutes.

**4.4. Senior SEE Program.**

4.4.1. NAF/CCs and OG/CCs may maintain SEE status in their primary assigned weapon system.



4.4.1.1. NAF/CVs and OG/CDs may perform this function if the principal incumbent is not qualified or available.

4.4.1.2. OG/CDs that operate different MDSs from the OG/CC in multi-MDS wings, or occupy a different crew position in the same MDS, may be designated as SEEs at the OG/CC's discretion.

4.4.1.3. Document designations IAW **paragraph 4.2.2.2.**

4.4.2. Individuals eligible for Senior SEE status do not require, nor do they have to maintain, instructor qualification, but they must have completed SEE certification IAW unit standards.

## Chapter 5

### CYBERCREW EVALUATIONS

**5.1. General.** The Cybercrew Stan/Eval Program utilizes cybercrew evaluations to ensure qualification of cybercrew members and supplementary evaluations to ensure standardization of operations.

5.1.1. To promote efficient use of resources, accomplish an individual's cybercrew qualification evaluations concurrently, whenever practical.

5.1.2. Evaluations in multiple crew positions and special mission qualifications (SMQ) will be addressed in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2. For guidance on supplementary evaluations, see [Chapter 7](#).

**5.2. Categories.** Cybercrew evaluations are divided into four categories: (Qualification (QUAL), Mission (MSN), SPOT and Instructor (INSTR)), each consisting of two structured phases, written and performance. (**Exception:** A SPOT evaluation may consist of only one phase, depending on its purpose.) Each phase requires the completion of requisites (see [paragraph 5.5](#)).

5.2.1. QUAL Evaluations. Units will assist OGV in the creation of QUAL evaluations to ensure it meets their operational needs, may be delegated down to individual units to accomplish.

5.2.1.1. Purpose. Ensure basic qualification in a MDS and/or cybercrew position.

5.2.1.2. Execution. All cybercrew will complete a periodic QUAL evaluation in their primary assigned MDS/crew position as specified in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2. QUAL evaluations may be combined with MSN evaluations IAW ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2. See ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 for SMQs.

5.2.2. MSN Evaluations. Squadrons are responsible for creating MSN evaluations or certifications, but can request development support from OGV and other operational squadrons. All MSN evaluations or certifications will be approved by the squadron's Certifying Official and will be provided to OGV.

5.2.2.1. Purpose. To ensure qualification to employ the cybercrew's assigned weapon system/crew position in the accomplishment of the unit's operational mission(s).

5.2.2.2. Execution. All cybercrew members maintaining Basic Mission Capable (BMC)/MR/Combat Mission Ready (CMR) status (IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*,) will complete a periodic evaluation as specified in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2. (T-2).

5.2.2.2.1. The MSN evaluation should reflect the type and difficulty of tasks required to fulfill the MDS operational mission.

5.2.3. SPOT Evaluations.

5.2.3.1. Purpose. Evaluate a specific event or requirement without intending to satisfy the requirements of a periodic evaluation and/or an INSTR evaluation.

5.2.3.2. Execution. A SPOT has no specific requisites, unless specified in unit supplements, but may be no notice (N/N) IAW [paragraph 5.2.5.3](#).

- 5.2.3.2.1. An examinee may utilize a SPOT evaluation to update a QUAL/MSN evaluation expiration date provided all requirements for the QUAL/MSN are completed within the periods described in [paragraph 5.8](#) (document on approved forms).
- 5.2.3.2.2. SQ/CCs may authorize additional missions in order to help the cybercrew accomplish periodic requirements (document on approved forms).
- 5.2.3.2.3. When the SEE administering a SPOT evaluation is not qualified in the MDS (e.g., a senior examiner), the evaluation will not be credited towards a periodic evaluation.
- 5.2.3.2.4. Any qualifying event and/or evaluation not listed in paragraphs [5.2.1](#) through [5.2.3](#) should be documented as a SPOT evaluation.
- 5.2.3.2.5. Objectivity evaluations should be documented as a SPOT on the approved forms.
- 5.2.3.3. Examiner Objectivity SPOT Evaluations are evaluations that may be used to assess the objectivity, decision making and skill of an Examiner in administering an evaluation.
- 5.2.3.3.1. Examiners can administer Examiner Objectivity SPOT evaluations to evaluators that hold the same or similar crew positions qualifications, in the same or similar MDS, at the discretion of the examinee's OG/CC, or ESAP team leader.

#### 5.2.4. INSTR Evaluations.

- 5.2.4.1. Purpose. To assess a cybercrew member's instructional ability in their MDS/crew position and to obtain/maintain Instructor Qualification.
- 5.2.4.2. Execution. Cybercrew members obtaining/regaining instructor qualification in an MDS/crew position must complete an evaluation of instructional capability in that position. Guidance for specialized, universal, and/or multiple qualified cybercrew will be specified in unit supplements and/or ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Volume 2. **(T-2) Exception:** When a complement of current and qualified Air Force instructors does not exist to accomplish initial unit INSTR Evaluations, with ACC/A3 approval and MDS FAM coordination, the OG/CC may establish an initial cadre (minimum required for initial conversion) of cyber instructors who do not require an Initial (INIT) INSTR evaluation. OG/CCs will notify ACC and provide initial cadre list for each crew position with current qualification and total mission and instructor hours if applicable. OG/CCs will use discretion when establishing initial cadre instructors and consider availability of suitable instructor courses. (See also [paragraph 5.12](#)).
- 5.2.4.2.1. Accomplish Initial (INIT) INSTR evaluations by instructing an actual student on an instructional mission to the maximum extent practical. When students are not available or mission/crew composition requirements prevent inclusion of students, another cybercrew member or the evaluator will serve as the student.
- 5.2.4.2.1.1. INIT INSTR evaluations may be used to update a required periodic evaluation if all required graded area requirements are completed during the instructor evaluation and the examinee subsequently completes all requisites for the evaluation within the periods described in [paragraph 5.5.3](#). Label the evaluation

appropriately (**Example:** "INIT INSTR/MSN"). Do not add on missions (sorties) to complete the requirements for a periodic evaluation unless the group/squadron commander concurs.

5.2.4.2.2. Evaluations of instructor qualification will be conducted during all subsequent periodic evaluations. (**T-2**).

5.2.4.2.3. Instructors whose QUAL and/or MSN evaluations have expired are not qualified to instruct in those areas (e.g., if an instructor's Mission Qualification expires, he/she may still instruct in Basic Qualification related areas as specified in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2).

5.2.5. Prefixes. The following prefixes should be used, when applicable, to further describe the evaluations listed in paragraphs **5.2.1** through **5.2.3**:

5.2.5.1. INIT. The first evaluation of any type, to include instructor qualification, in a specific weapon system/crew position (e.g., INIT QUAL, INIT MSN, INIT INSTR).

5.2.5.2. Requalification (RQ). An evaluation administered to remedy a loss of qualification due to expiration of a required periodic evaluation, loss of currency exceeding six months (as specified in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 1), following a failed evaluation, or a commander-directed downgrade. A requalification evaluation requires documentation.

5.2.5.2.1. Expiration of a required periodic evaluation. The requalification will be IAW the guidance for that periodic evaluation.

5.2.5.2.2. Loss of currency that requires a requalification evaluation (IAW ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 1). In this case RQ SPOT will be used for documentation (see **Chapter 8**). The requal profile will be as directed by the SQ/CC and will include, as a minimum, those items for which the individual is non-current and which require an evaluation IAW the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 1/2.

5.2.5.2.3. Completion of a qualification evaluation in a different MDS. The requal will be IAW the guidance for the periodic evaluation in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 and will include, as a minimum, those items for which the individual is regaining qualification.

5.2.5.2.4. A performance requal following a failed periodic evaluation. The requal will be IAW the provisions of **paragraph 5.6.1**.

5.2.5.2.5. Loss of qualification due to a commander-directed downgrade (see **paragraph 5.9**). The requal profile will be as directed by the commander on the ACC Form 4418 (see **Chapter 8**).

5.2.5.2.6. The RQ prefix will not be used to prefix a requal following a failed INIT evaluation. No qualification was achieved, thus requalification is not possible.

5.2.5.3. No-Notice (N/N).

5.2.5.3.1. The N/N evaluation provides commanders a sampling of daily cybercrew performance and an assessment of unit training effectiveness.

5.2.5.3.2. A N/N evaluation is one where the examinee is notified of the evaluation at or after the beginning of the cybercrew changeover/beginning of the mission/sortie.

5.2.5.3.3. A N/N cannot be combined with an INIT evaluation.

5.2.5.4. Multiple Prefixes. More than one prefix may be used to describe an evaluation). The applicability of any prefixes to portions of any combined evaluations and the purpose for any prefixes (if not obvious by the context of the evaluation) will be explained on the approved form as discussed at [Chapter 8](#).

5.2.5.5. Examiner Objectivity Evaluations. An evaluation of the objectivity and skill of a lower echelon examiner in administering an evaluation. Use SPOT as the type of evaluation, then explain in the mission description that the evaluation was an examiner Objectivity Evaluation. Overall rating for this type of an evaluation will be either qualified (1) or unqualified (3).

5.2.5.5.1. The grading criteria in [Attachment 5](#) will be used.

5.2.5.5.2. A qualified rating (1) indicates that the examiner objectivity examinee complied with HHQ and local Stan/Eval directives, properly briefed and debriefed the examinee, correctly identified discrepancies, awarded the correct grade for each evaluated area, awarded the appropriate overall grade and, if required, assigned appropriate additional training.

5.2.5.5.3. An unqualified rating (3) will be awarded when the examiner failed to satisfy the requirements of a qualification rating (1). The certification of the lower level examiner receiving an unqualified examiner Objectivity Evaluation will be determined by the SQ/CC or OG/CC as applicable. The SQ/CC or OG/CC may, at his/her discretion issue a commander directed ACC Form 4418 for the examinee based upon the higher level examiner recommendation.

### 5.3. Grading System.

5.3.1. A two-step grading system is used to evaluate and document cybercrew performance.

5.3.1.1. In the first step, individual grades are assigned to each requisite to include the grading of areas/subareas of cybercrew performance against established evaluation criteria (see [paragraph 5.4](#)). Performance less than fully qualified must be documented.

5.3.1.2. In the second step, an overall qualification level is assigned based on a compilation of all individual requisite grades (see [paragraph 5.3.3.5](#)).

5.3.2. Performance Areas/Subareas.

5.3.2.1. Areas/subareas will have a two-tier (Q/U) or three-tier (Q/Q-/U) grading system. Discrepancies will be documented against the established areas/subareas.

5.3.2.1.1. Q indicates the examinee demonstrated both a satisfactory knowledge of all required information and performed cybercrew duties within the prescribed tolerances.

5.3.2.1.2. Q- indicates the examinee is qualified to perform the assigned area/subarea tasks, but requires debriefing or additional training as determined by the SEE. Deviations must not exceed the prescribed Q- tolerances, jeopardize safety, or be a breach of crew discipline.

- 5.3.2.1.3. U indicates that performance was outside allowable parameters thereby compromising crew safety; that deviates from prescribed procedures/tolerances adversely affected mission accomplishment; and/or evaluated performance constituted a breach of crew discipline. An examinee receiving an area/subarea grade of U requires debriefing and/or additional training, as determined by the SEE.
- 5.3.2.2. Remedial Action. All grades of Q- or U require remedial action that includes either debriefing discrepancies and/or assignment of additional training.
- 5.3.2.2.1. Debriefed Discrepancy. Remedial action accomplished during debrief of the evaluation wherein the SEE provides instruction concerning the discrepancy and determines that the examinee has gained the necessary knowledge or proficiency.
- 5.3.2.2.2. Additional Training. Any training recommended by the SEE to remedy deficiencies identified during an evaluation.
- 5.3.2.2.2.1. May include self-study, academic instruction, use of a simulator (SIM)/Cybercrew Training Device (CTD) or mission.
- 5.3.2.2.2.2. Will be complete no more than 60 calendar days (120 calendar days for Air Reserve Component (ARC)) following the date of the discrepancy.
- 5.3.2.2.2.3. If a cybercrew member exceeds the allotted time for completion of additional training, the SQ/CC will review the situation and direct appropriate action. Document the circumstances with a Memorandum for Record (MFR) to be included in the ACC Form 4418 (see [Chapter 8](#)).
- 5.3.2.2.2.4. Document additional training on the ACC Form 4418 IAW paragraph [8.3.5.6](#) and [8.3.7.3.4](#).
- 5.3.2.2.2.5. Units will outline procedures for ensuring additional training is accomplished.
- 5.3.2.3. The SEE must grade the areas/subareas listed as —required in the general and specific evaluation sections of the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.
- 5.3.2.4. In addition to required areas/subareas, the SEE will grade any area/subarea observed during an evaluation if performance in that area/subarea impacts the specific evaluation accomplished or overall crew safety.
- 5.3.2.5. Grading criteria tolerances assume optimal network and stable weapon system conditions.
- 5.3.2.6. Momentary deviations from tolerances will not be considered in the grading, provided the examinee applies prompt corrective action and such deviations do not jeopardize safety. Cumulative deviations will be considered when determining the overall grade. The SEE will state the examinee's overall rating, review with the examinee the area grades assigned, thoroughly critique specific deviations, and recommend/assign any required additional training.
- 5.3.2.7. The SEE may further identify any area/sub-area as Commendable if, in the examiner's determination, the cybercrew member has demonstrated exceptional skill and knowledge. Document IAW [Chapter 8](#).

5.3.3. Qualification Levels. Qualification levels are assigned both to individual evaluations (i.e. performance evals and EPEs) as well as overall performance. Individual evaluations are graded as a compilation of all area/sub-area grades. Overall performance is graded as a compilation of all requisites associated with the required evaluation. Both individual and overall grades are based on the following.

5.3.3.1. Exceptionally Qualified (EQ) Designation. An EQ may be given, but will only be applied to the overall grade - not to separate requisites. Document on the ACC Form 4418 IAW paragraphs [8.3.5.6](#) and [8.3.7.2](#). An EQ may be given when:

5.3.3.1.1. The cybercrew member has demonstrated exceptional skill and knowledge in all phases of the evaluation;

5.3.3.1.2. The cybercrew member has not failed any requisite and;

5.3.3.1.3. The cybercrew member received a Q on all areas/subareas evaluated and;

5.3.3.1.4. The operator passed written exam with a score of 95-100.

5.3.3.2. Q1. The cybercrew member demonstrated desired performance and knowledge of procedures, equipment and directives within tolerances specified in the grading criteria. This will be awarded when no discrepancies were noted, but may be awarded when discrepancies are noted if:

5.3.3.2.1. No U grades were awarded for any discrepancy area/sub-area.

5.3.3.2.2. In the judgment of the SEE, none of the discrepancies preclude awarding of an overall Q1.

5.3.3.2.3. All areas/sub-areas graded as Q- during the evaluation were cleared during the evaluation debrief.

5.3.3.3. Q2. The cybercrew member demonstrated the ability to perform duties safely, but:

5.3.3.3.1. There were one or more area(s)/subarea(s) where additional training was assigned.

5.3.3.3.2. A non-critical area/subarea grade of U was awarded.

5.3.3.3.3. In the judgment of the SEE, a Q2 may be given if there is justification based on Q- performance in one or several areas/subareas.

5.3.3.4. Q3. The cybercrew member demonstrated an unacceptable level of safety, performance or knowledge.

5.3.3.4.1. Any critical area graded U requires an overall Q3 (applicable to both performance evaluations and EPEs).

5.3.3.4.2. In the judgment of the SEE, a Q3 may be given if there is justification based on Q-/U performance in one or several non-critical areas/subareas.

5.3.3.5. Assigning the overall qualification level.

5.3.3.5.1. The performance-phase SEE is the examiner responsible for assigning the overall qualification level.



5.3.3.5.2. An overall grade of Q1 or Q2 will be given only after all evaluation requirements (to include required examinations) have been completed and given due consideration.

5.3.3.5.3. An overall grade of Q3 may be awarded at any time.

5.3.3.5.4. While ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 may dictate the highest grade for a performance or Emergency Procedures Evaluation (EPE) based on area and subarea performance, SEE judgment will always be the determining factor in deciding the overall grade.

#### **5.4. Evaluation Criteria.**

5.4.1. The MAJCOM will establish and maintain standardized MSN, QUAL, and INSTR evaluation criteria in the appropriate ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2. The MAJCOM will coordinate with the program managers of any command-mandated software on any updates of eval criteria to aid in the expeditious revision of eval criteria. The MAJCOM is also responsible for coordinating the establishment of the following:

5.4.1.1. Areas/subareas including the identification of critical areas and those areas required for evaluation completion. These areas/subareas will be arranged into general and specific evaluation areas.

5.4.1.1.1. Critical areas are those areas that, upon failure, would most adversely affect the qualification of a cybercrew member. Critical areas will include, but are not limited to Safety and Crew Discipline.

5.4.1.2. Publications Checks are required for QUAL evaluations and may be accomplished on other evaluations.

5.4.1.2.1. Each cybercrew member is responsible for utilizing required crew publications as outlined in applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) volumes.

5.4.1.2.2. Q performance requires individual crew publications be current and properly posted. In units that do not issue individual cybercrew publications, cybercrew members are still responsible for utilizing the most accurate and current of all publications required for the mission.

**5.5. Requisites.** These include both written and performance phase items. The written phase, when required, includes a series of examinations (see [Chapter 6](#)) as well as evaluation of cybercrew performance in a controlled emergency procedures environment (i.e. EPEs, see [paragraph 5.5.1.2](#)). The performance phase includes a mission and/or simulator evaluation of cybercrew performance.

5.5.1. Written Phase Requisites.

5.5.1.1. Written phase requisites for each evaluation include the following.

5.5.1.1.1. QUAL: Open book examination and/or closed book examination, and EPE as specified in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

5.5.1.1.2. MSN: As specified in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

5.5.1.2. Emergency Procedures Evaluations (EPEs).



- 5.5.1.2.1. Purpose. Evaluate a cybercrew member's knowledge of MDS-Specific emergency procedures (EPs) and systems for all QUAL evaluations (as applicable); evaluate mission-specific EPs and tactical systems knowledge during MSN evaluations.
- 5.5.1.2.2. Execution. ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 will specify contents of EPEs, areas to be evaluated, grading criteria, and whether EPEs may be done during mission performance, in a simulator/CTD, or verbally.
- 5.5.1.2.2.1. Only one EPE needs to be accomplished for each combined evaluation (i.e., one EPE for a QUAL/MSN).
- 5.5.1.2.2.2. A single EPE may be used for separate evaluations (e.g. a MSN and INSTR/QUAL eval) as long as the combined EPE is of a scope and duration to cover required areas and is conducted within the eligibility period for each evaluation (see [paragraph 5.8](#)).
- 5.5.1.2.3. Grading. Q1 performance for EPEs requires taking the proper action in the correct sequence. Each cybercrew member is responsible for the critical action procedures (CAP) applicable to their crew position.
- 5.5.1.2.4. Additional Training. For an EPE requiring additional training, the SEE will indicate if the additional training must be accomplished before the next unsupervised mission (see also [paragraph 5.3.2.2.2](#)). Document IAW [Chapter 8](#).
- 5.5.1.2.5. CAPs Failure. An incorrect response to a CAP situation (if applicable) during an EPE requires an EPE grade of unqualified. Under these circumstances, the examinee will not operate mission again until a successful reevaluation is accomplished (either written, verbally, or in a simulator/CTD as determined by the SEE).
- 5.5.1.2.6. Unqualified EPE. An examinee receiving an EPE grade of unqualified will be placed on supervised status IAW [paragraph 5.7](#).
- 5.5.2. Performance Phase Requisites. The performance phase for cybercrew evaluations include execution in the weapon system and/or a suitable simulator/CTD (unless restricted by ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2).
- 5.5.2.1. Evaluation profiles will be realistic, reflect unit tasking, be consistent with daily training missions, and incorporate current tactics applicable to the unit mission. Evaluation profiles outline additional evaluation policies and profiles for all MDSs and cybercrew positions.
- 5.5.2.2. The evaluation profile used to fulfill the performance phase requisite must incorporate all appropriate requirements set in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2, and allow accurate measure of the proficiency of the examinee.
- 5.5.3. Requisite Completion.
- 5.5.3.1. In-the-Eligibility Period. For scheduled or no-notice periodic evaluations in the eligibility period, all requisites must be completed within the eligibility period of the current evaluation (see [paragraph 5.8](#)). The OG/CC may waive this requirement on a case-by-case basis (document on the ACC Form 4418 IAW [Chapter 8](#)).

5.5.3.2. Out-of-the-Eligibility Period. For periodic evaluations accomplished outside the eligibility period, all requisites must be completed within a six-month period beginning with the month in which the first written/phase requisite or performance evaluation was administered, whichever occurs first. **Exception:** For extended evaluations (IAW [paragraph 5.8.3.2](#)), requisites may be completed between the beginning of the six-month eligibility period prior to the original expiration date and the extended expiration date.

5.5.3.3. One set of requisites may be used to satisfy the requirements of combined evaluations as defined in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

5.5.3.4. Requisites from a completed evaluation may be used for subsequent evaluations provided they cover all required areas and are within the ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 defined zone for each evaluation.

## 5.6. Failure to Pass a Performance Evaluation.

5.6.1. Requal. If a cybercrew member fails a performance evaluation, a successful performance requal must be completed by 75 calendar days (150 calendar days for Air Reserve Component).

5.6.1.1. OG/CCs may approve waivers to the time limit on a case-by-case basis.

5.6.1.2. Certifying official will determine the requirements that need to be accomplished prior to requal, based on the individual's experience level, present qualifications and hours of training required.

5.6.1.3. The SEE that administered the original evaluation will not normally administer the requal unless approved by the Certifying Official.

5.6.1.4. A requal is successfully completed when the cybercrew member performs to Q or Q on each area graded U.

5.6.1.5. Simulator requals may be directed when the SEE deems a full performance requal unnecessary, but are accomplished subsequent to the debriefing of a Q3 evaluation (document IAW [Chapter 8](#)).

5.6.1.6. Requisites that were valid for a failed evaluation per [paragraph 5.5.3.1](#) or [5.5.3.2](#) remain valid, IAW the paragraphs above.

5.6.2. Status Downgrade. Cybercrew members receiving a Q3 QUAL and/or MSN evaluation are non-mission ready (N-MR)/non-combat mission ready (N-CMR)/non-basic mission capable (N-BMC)/ IAW ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 1. For instructor evaluations, cybercrew status (i.e., MR/CMR or BMC) need not be downgraded if the discrepancies were only in instructor areas/subareas.

5.6.3. Restrictions. When called for by this instruction or deemed necessary in the judgment of the SEE, performance restrictions will be imposed on the examinee until successful completion of assigned additional training and/or a requal.

5.6.3.1. Restrictions should address the specific phase of mission and/or operation that requires supervision and the criteria for removal of the restrictions.

5.6.3.1.1. QUAL Evaluation: Place the examinee on supervised status (see [paragraph 5.7](#)) in the weapon system/mission in which the evaluation was administered.

5.6.3.1.2. MSN Evaluation: The examinee may perform basic qualification tasks unless specifically restricted. Place the examinee on supervised status for mission tasks.

5.6.3.1.3. INSTR Evaluation (or any evaluation where instructor qualifications are being evaluated): Instructors receiving an unsatisfactory grade in any instructor area(s) will not perform instructor duties until a successful requalification evaluation is completed.

5.6.3.2. Restrict cybercrew members receiving a Q3 on any evaluation until a successful requal is completed (see [paragraph 5.6.1](#)).

5.6.3.3. Document restrictions on approved forms.

## 5.7. Supervised Status.

5.7.1. If unsatisfactory performance or restrictions require an examinee be placed on supervised status.

5.7.1.1. Supervision will only be accomplished by instructors current/certified in that position. **(T-3)**.

5.7.1.2. Units will establish processes to track unit personnel placed in supervised status, through a consolidated list to be utilized for operations and mission planning purposes. **(T-2)**.

## 5.8. Timing of Cyber Qualification Evaluations.

5.8.1. Expiration Date. Required periodic evaluations expire on the last day of the 17th month following the month in which the performance phase was successfully completed (e.g. a periodic evaluation in which the performance phase was completed on 9 Oct 10 expires on 31 Mar 12.).

5.8.2. Eligibility Period. Periodic evaluations will be scheduled in the eligibility period, defined as the six-month period prior to the expiration date.

5.8.3. Out-of-the-Eligibility Period. On a case-by-case basis, periodic evaluations may be scheduled before or after the eligibility period according to the following criteria:

5.8.3.1. Evaluations Conducted Prior to the Eligibility Period. SQ/CCs may authorize individuals to complete periodic evaluations prior to the eligibility period (document IAW [Chapter 8](#))

5.8.3.2. Extended Evaluations.

5.8.3.2.1. SQ/CC-Extended Evaluations. SQ/CCs may extend the expiration date of periodic evaluations up to three months for the reasons listed below (document IAW [Chapter 8, paragraph 8.7.3.2.2](#)). Extensions will be on a case-by-case basis and this paragraph is not authority to grant blanket extensions. For individual extensions longer than three months, group or blanket extensions, see [paragraph 5.8.3.2.2](#) Requisites not completed during the original eligibility period must be completed prior to the extended expiration date.

5.8.3.2.1.1. PCS/PCA to a non-operational assignment.

5.8.3.2.1.2. Departing PCS or TDY for retraining in another weapon system type.

5.8.3.2.1.3. Undergoing unit weapon system conversion, as directed by MAJCOM.

5.8.3.2.1.4. Removal from active operations status (e.g. separation or retirement).

5.8.3.2.1.5. Participation in real world operations (to include operations other than war, alert, etc.) who are not able to complete the required performance evaluation(s) before or during deployment.

5.8.3.2.2. MAJCOM-Extended Evaluations. MAJCOM/A3 may extend evaluation expiration dates for cybercrew members for up to six months. Units will submit extension requests through normal Stan/Eval channels and report approved extension requests in the SEB minutes.

#### 5.8.3.3. Non-Standard Approval Authority

5.8.3.3.1. For SQ/CCs and above (e.g. OG/CCs, WG/CCs, etc.), the approval authority is the next commander in the examinee's operations chain of command.

5.8.3.3.2. In all other cases, if the operations chain of command differs from administrative chain of command (e.g. HHQ attached operators), approvals will be by the attached unit/CC with the concurrence of the examinee's immediate administrative supervisor.

5.8.3.3.3. For individuals not assigned to a MAJCOM, AF/A3C/A6C is the approval authority.

5.8.4. Failure to Complete a Periodic Evaluation within the Eligibility Period. If a cybercrew member fails to complete an evaluation (either written/non-performance phase or performance phase) within the eligibility period for an in-the-eligibility period evaluation (see [paragraph 5.8.1](#)) or within the period for an out-of-the-eligibility period evaluation (see [paragraph 5.8.2](#)), the cybercrew member loses the qualification covered by the evaluation and the restrictions of [paragraph 5.6.3](#) apply.

5.8.4.1. Qualification may be re-established by accomplishing a complete requalification evaluation (to include requisites) or by completion of the expired evaluation.

5.8.4.2. OG/CCs may waive the re-accomplishment of completed requisites on a case-by-case basis (document IAW [paragraph 8.7.3.2.2](#)).

**5.9. Commander-Directed Downgrade.** Any commander (squadron or above) may direct a downgrade (Q-/U) in a specific area/sub-area without unqualifying an individual. Additionally, a commander may direct a downgrade that either removes a qualification (e.g. instructor to operator) or completely unqualifies an individual (e.g. qualified operator to unqualified operator). Downgrades may be directed without administering an evaluation using the following guidance:

5.9.1. For operational-related cases, use for cause only (e.g., breach of crew discipline, safety, etc.). Incidents do not have to be directly observed by an examiner, but may be recommended by an examiner from any MDS/cybercrew specialty.

5.9.2. For non-operational-related cases, do not use as a substitution for, or in lieu of, administrative or judicial actions (e.g. Letter of Counseling, Article 15, etc.). (Consult with the supporting Staff Judge Advocate office for legal advice in these cases.) Use in cases where such incidences directly affect the commander's confidence in the cybercrew member's ability to safely operate the weapon system and/or equipment (e.g. lapse in judgment significant

enough to cast doubt on the cybercrew member's decision-making abilities on the weapon system).

5.9.3. For downgrades that either remove qualifications or completely unqualify an individual, the affected cybercrew member will cease acting in the qualification(s) from which they have been downgraded effective with the date the commander initiated the downgrade.

5.9.4. Commander Directed Downgrades will be documented IAW [paragraph 8.4](#).

**5.10. Multiple Qualification.** Multiple qualification guidance applies to cybercrew members who maintain qualification in two or more MDS.

5.10.1. Wings may authorize qualification in more than one weapon system for crewmembers only when such action is directed by command mission requirements and is economically justifiable. This authority cannot be delegated below the Group level.

5.10.2. When separate qualifications are not required, document certification in different MDS series using MAJCOM guidance on approved use of a unit certification document signed by an authorized official.

5.10.3. Documentation. Document MAJCOM authority for multiple qualification, including a list of weapon systems in which qualification will be maintained IAW [paragraph 8.7.3.2.2](#).

5.10.4. QUAL and MSN Evaluations. All cybercrew require a QUAL evaluation, and, if applicable, a MSN evaluation, to include requisites, in each MDS weapon system they maintain qualification according to applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

5.10.4.1. Unit supplements may provide guidance for local evaluation profiles of cybercrew who hold multiple qualifications to ensure graded areas that are common among those qualifications are only evaluated once within a single evaluation cycle.

5.10.5. Failure to Pass an Evaluation. A downgrade resulting from a Q3 in a QUAL or MSN evaluation applies only to the weapon system for which the evaluation was administered unless, in the opinion of the examiner, the discrepancy is applicable to additional MDSs.

**5.11. Cybercrew Operating in Non-USAF Weapon Systems and with Non-USAF Units.** Cybercrew members authorized to perform duties in non-USAF weapon systems or on duty with or attached to non-USAF units (e.g., NSA) for operations, abide by host service/agency or host country guidance.

5.11.1. Cybercrew assigned to non-USAF units (Joint cyber teams) may not be required to abide by AFCYBER policies, including ACCI 17-202 Vol 2 and ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2. As a result, personnel returning from Joint cyber units must complete applicable training and evaluations that may have expired during their joint assignment. The restrictions in [paragraph 5.6.3](#) apply to such individuals until successful evaluations are completed.

5.11.2. MAJCOM/A3s may approve exceptions to requirements for returning cybercrew members to complete applicable requisites and expired USAF evaluations, if they determine non-USAF evaluations are equivalent to applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 evaluations (document IAW [paragraph 8.7.3.2.2](#)).

5.11.3. USAF units that use non-USAF platforms to execute a USAF mission/program will comply with current USAF guidance, unless platform owner has established guidance.

## 5.12. Initial Cadre.

5.12.1. Cybercrew members will be nominated by the Cyber Operations Group Commanders (COG/CC) as initial cadre. Members who are appointed by ACC/A3 as initial cadre either for a new mission set requiring a MSN qualification or for a new MDS where no SEE currently exists will comply with the intent of this instruction. These members will be the initial qualified crew as well as instructors and/or evaluators.

5.12.2. See **Chapter 8** for appropriate documentation.

5.12.3. Units will indicate through MFR which cybercrew are appointed as initial cadre and include in the CEF IAW **paragraph 8.7.3.2.2**.

5.12.3.1. Initial Cadre appointment letters are routed through ACC/A3TV for ACC/A3 approval. Copies of the signed memoranda are retained on the ACC/A3TV SharePoint® Site.

5.12.4. Tailor recurring evaluations to program requirements and weapon system capabilities. Simulators may be used to satisfy recurring evaluation requirements.

## Chapter 6

### CYBERCREW EXAMINATION PROGRAM

**6.1. Purpose.** The cybercrew examination measures cybercrew member knowledge of normal/emergency procedures, threats, and other information essential for the safe and effective operation of their assigned weapon system through the administration of written or computer-based examinations.

**6.2. Scope.** This chapter applies to all designated cybercrew members who require an examination to establish weapon system qualification. The examinations in this chapter includes requisites for periodic evaluations and unit periodic examinations. Requirements include qualification closed and/or optionally open book examinations, and EPEs as described in [paragraph 5.5.1.2](#).

#### **6.3. Administrative Procedures.**

6.3.1. Documentation. Units will document the unit-level cybercrew examination.

6.3.2. Computer-Based Examinations. MAJCOM directed Stan/Eval software may fulfill the requirement for exams as outlined in this instruction.

6.3.3. Retention of Examination Records. Retain graded exam answer sheets/computer records until the ACC Form 4418 is completed.

#### **6.4. Written Exam Sources.**

6.4.1. Open Book Exams. Open book questions will come from publications containing information pertinent to the operation of applicable weapon system (and/or components) and performance of the assigned mission.

6.4.1.1. The open book subject areas and the publications used to generate the exam will be made available to cybercrew during testing. Electronic publications may be used as references for open book examinations.

6.4.1.2. Each unit will develop, as required, an open book Secure Question Bank (SQB) that serves as the source for the open book exam. Do not distribute the SQB to unit cybercrews and safeguard it in the same manner as any other required Stan/Eval exam.

6.4.1.3. The Emphasis of open book exams is placed on technical orders, manuals, handbooks, or instructions that may not require immediate recall or are not regularly referenced.

6.4.2. Closed Book Exams. Questions will come from MQFs.

6.4.2.1. Each unit will maintain an MQF that serves as the source for the closed book exam. OGV will review all MQFs and prepared exams for accuracy annually and after any changes in source documents. Cybercrew members may have access to MQFs.

6.4.2.2. Local Procedures MQF. Units may develop and distribute a local procedures MQF to augment MDS/crew position-specific MQFs. Units may include any information necessary for mission accomplishment not included in the MAJCOM MQF. Local instructions, procedures, unit supplements to ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 3, are examples



of sources for the Local Procedures MQF. If used, no more than ten percent (10%) of closed book examination questions will come from the local procedures MQF. **(T-3)**.

6.4.3. Exam Question Review. The OG Stan/Eval functions will review all MDS/crew position-specific MQFs, SQBs, and prepared exams (if used) annually and after any changes in source documents. If a complete review was accomplished due to a source document change it may be annotated as the annual review. Units should document procedures for the exam reviews in local instructions or supplements.

**6.5. End-of-Course Exams.** Formal Training Units (FTUs) administering USAF Formal School courses listed in the Air Force Education and Training Course Announcement (ETCA) database (<https://cs2.eis.af.mil/sites/app10-ETCA/SitePages/Home.aspx>) may use end-of-course (EOC) exams to fulfill the requirements of the open book, closed book and EPEs (if applicable) exams.

6.5.1. The MAJCOM Stan/Eval agencies responsible for training will ensure the EOC exam meets the requirements of this instruction and ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 before awarding credit for requisite completion.

6.5.2. EOC exam questions do not need to incorporate MDS/crew position-specific MQFs. All questions must reflect the latest changes to all systems and/or operational procedures and not conflict with any MQFs.

6.5.3. All EOC exams that fulfill the requirements of requisites will be graded according to **paragraph 6.8** and entered on the ACC Form 4418 according to **paragraph 8.3.5.1**.

**6.6. Exam Management.** With the exception of written EPE exams (if applicable), units will either maintain prepared exams for each crew position or generate a unique exam for each cybercrew member.

6.6.1. If prepared exams are maintained for each crew position:

6.6.1.1. Units are required to develop and control a minimum of two exams for each crew position.

6.6.1.2. When different crew positions are responsible for the same information, units are not required to maintain separate exams for each crew position.

6.6.1.3. Change a minimum of 25 percent of the questions on each prepared exam each calendar year.

6.6.2. If a unique exam is generated for each cybercrew member:

6.6.2.1. Units may use MAJCOM-approved software for exam creation.

6.6.2.2. Requisite exam databases will contain at least twice the number of questions required for each exam (e.g. if a 50-question exam is generated, there must be at least 100 questions in the exam database).

6.6.3. When published guidance changes, the associated prepared exam or exam database (depending on method used) will be updated as soon as possible upon receipt.

**6.7. Exam Security.** Stan/Eval personnel will maintain positive control and distribution of all requisite exams, applicable answer sheets, and associated computer-based media.



## 6.8. Grading.

- 6.8.1. EPEs. If required and/or used, grade EPE exams on the two-tier grading system (i.e., Q/U).
- 6.8.2. Written or Computer-Based Examinations. Grade written or computer based examinations as a percentage of correct answers. The minimum passing grade is 80 percent. All questions missed will be reviewed immediately following the exam.
- 6.8.3. Units will grade all requisite and/or CAPs exams prior to the cybercrew member's next mission.

## 6.9. Failure to Pass a Requisite Examination.

- 6.9.1. Reexamination Policy. A cybercrew member failing a requisite exam must be afforded an adequate study period prior to reexamination. For other than CAPs, the cybercrew member will be reevaluated using an alternate exam.
- 6.9.2. Reexamination Period. Cybercrew members who fail a requisite exam must complete a successful reexam by the end of the third month following the date of the first failure, or the end of their eligibility period, whichever occurs first. Waiver authority to extend the time allowed to successfully complete the reexam is the OG/CC (document IAW [paragraph 8.7.3.2.2](#)).
- 6.9.3. CAPs Reexamination Restriction. Cybercrew members failing a CAPs exam will not perform mission as cybercrew members until a successful CAPs reexam is accomplished.
- 6.9.4. Supervised Status For Examination Failure.
  - 6.9.4.1. Place cybercrew members who fail a requisite open/closed book exam in supervised status IAW [paragraph 5.7](#) until successful retesting is completed.
  - 6.9.4.2. For cybercrew members who maintain multiple qualifications, supervised status resulting from failure of either an open or closed book examination applies only to the cybercrew position for which the examination was administered.

## 6.10. Unit Periodic Examinations (Optional). If used, MAJCOMs and/or units will include guidance in their supplements to include procedures for failed exams.

- 6.10.1. Each group/squadron Stan/Eval function may conduct periodic testing for all cybercrew. The intent of this testing is to evaluate additional knowledge beyond the scope of requisite exams, such as a cross-section of general knowledge, tactical/threat knowledge, and/or operational procedures, etc., to determine if knowledge deficiencies exist within the unit.
- 6.10.2. Periodic exams will not count as a requisite exam, nor will a requisite exam satisfy the requirement for a periodic exam.
  - 6.10.2.1. Each unit will conduct periodic testing at least semiannually for all cybercrew members. The OG/CC will determine whether the test is administered open or closed book and whether proctoring is required. A majority of the questions must come from sources other than MAJCOM-approved MQFs (e.g., manuals, Instructions, Special Instructions (SPINS)).
  - 6.10.2.2. Tracking of periodic testing will be IAW ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

## Chapter 7

### ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS (CIF, SPECIAL INTEREST ITEM (SII), GO/NO-GO, SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATIONS)

#### 7.1. CIF.

7.1.1. Unit Stan/Eval will establish and maintain a library consisting of a current read file and publications. This library will consist of the items listed in **Table 7.1** in either hardcopy or electronic format. If a unit establishes a paper library, it will be organized into volumes as shown in the table. Co-located units may use a consolidate CIF library.

7.1.2. CIFs will be issued to alert crewmembers to changes to written guidance that affect cyberspace operations, but actual publication changes must be accomplished IAW established procedural guidance, to include DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Process and Procedures*, (as applicable) and TO 00-5-1.

7.1.2.1. MAJCOMs will advise corrective actions when releasing a CIF item that affects a weapon system. CIF items that affect weapon systems will include designated MAJCOM applicability.

7.1.2.2. CIF items that contain weapon system data will be controlled IAW the applicable distribution statement in the governing TO.

7.1.3. Required Volumes. Volume I is a table of contents for all volumes and current read file items, Volumes II through IV are made up of publications and weapon system manuals, and Volume V (optional) is reserved for safety information. If units choose hardcopy format and the contents of any volume exceed the capacity of its binder, use an additional binder and identify the first and subsequent binders by a letter of sequence (e.g., IIIA, IIIB). Label binders on the spine indicating Volume and Title as follows:

7.1.3.1. Wing/Group agencies desiring to insert information into the CIF will submit the information to OGV for coordination and distribution (Volume V excluded). Items entered into Volume I will be limited to those items that contain information temporary in nature. Subject matter may be condensed for incorporation into Vol 1 if necessary. Above the Wing/Group level, the NAF or MAJCOM Stan/Eval function is the focal point for CIF information.

7.1.3.2. Units utilizing electronic media will ensure electronic backup copies of CIF Volumes I and II (paper or electronic) are maintained.

7.1.3.3. If a hard copy library is used, OGVs will establish local procedures for maintaining accuracy and currency of HHQ issued messages in the local supplements or process guides. **(T-2)**.

**Table 7.1. Required Volumes.**

VOLUME	TITLE
VOLUME I	Table of Contents/Current Read File
VOLUME II	Publications—Air Force or MAJCOM Instructions/MAJCOM Supplements including, at a minimum, those listed in Table 7.2
VOLUME III	Publications—MAJCOM/NAF/Local Directives
VOLUME IV	Manuals/Checklists/Crew Aids/Technical Orders
VOLUME V (optional)	Safety Information

7.1.4. Current Read File. Volume I consists of a minimum of two parts to include an Index (Part A) and Current Read Files (Parts B and C (**Note:** Part C is optional)). MAJCOMs may add additional components to Volume I as appropriate.

7.1.4.1. Part A is a table of contents listing all material contained in CIF Volumes I through V.

7.1.4.2. Part B is the Current Read File of CIF messages. Messages contain information temporary in nature, directly pertinent to the safe conduct of operations, and must be read before missions. CIFs that contain weapon system-related information will be forwarded to all using MAJCOMs.

7.1.4.2.1. MAJCOM directed CIF items for Part B are approved by ACC/A3 and coordinated through other using MAJCOMS.

7.1.4.3. Part C is the Current Read File that contains information temporary in nature but not related to the safe conduct of operations and not required to be read before missions.

7.1.4.4. Refer to [Attachment 4](#) for a sample CIF template.

7.1.5. Publications Library. Volumes II through IV will consist of a CIF Functional Publications Library. See DAFMAN 90-161 for basic library requirements.

7.1.5.1. All publications in the library will be current and complete. MAJCOMs may authorize units to withhold posting of information that does not apply based on weapon system configuration.

7.1.5.2. Units will establish and maintain a table of contents for the publications library containing, as a minimum, a listing of basic publications numbers and short titles. Publication dates, supplements and changes are not required.

**Table 7.2. Volume II Mandatory Publications.**

PUBLICATION	TITLE
ACCI 17-202V1	Cybercrew Training
ACCMAN 17-2(MDS)V1	[MDS] Cybercrew Training
ACCI 17-202V2	[MDS] Cybercrew Standardization Evaluation Program
ACCMAN 17-2(MDS)V2	[MDS] Cybercrew Evaluation Criteria
ACCI 17-202V3	Cyberspace Operations Procedures
ACCMAN 17-2(MDS)V3	MDS Cyberspace Operations Procedures

7.1.5.3. MAJCOMs may waive Volumes II-V requirements for special training units (e.g., Red Flag).

7.1.5.4. The CIF index and library will be filed IAW DAFMAN 90-161, regardless of hard copy or electronic format.

7.1.5.4.1. If any part of the CIF library is maintained electronically and not specifically addressed above (or in DAFMAN 90-161 and/or TO 00-5-1), units will ensure that the information is current and accessible for concurrent viewing by multiple cybercrew members.

7.1.5.4.2. At a minimum, units will maintain the required index and location of electronic files in a hard-copy binder in the CIF library.

7.1.5.4.3. Documents in the CIF library will be made available for deployments (as required) via either electronic or hardcopy means.

## **7.2. Operations Related SII.**

7.2.1. Operations Related SIIs are items of emphasis relating to existing procedure(s) designed to mitigate or eliminate specific risks or trends.

7.2.1.1. SIIs do not add to or amend established procedures (reference guidance on issuing CIFs in [paragraph 7.1](#)).

7.2.1.2. SIIs will be based on analysis of risks and trends from a variety of sources to include Operational Review Boards and Safety Investigation Board (SIB) findings/recommendations, safety related incidences, trend analysis, deployed area of operations and potential problems with equipment/procedures.

7.2.2. SII(s) will be issued through the same process used to release CIFs with the following elements:

7.2.2.1. Specific MDS applicability.

7.2.2.2. References (document, SIB, etc).

7.2.2.3. Risk factors and trend details.

7.2.2.4. Specific emphasis actions to reduce/eliminate the risk or trend that generated the SII.

7.2.2.5. Effective date of rescission.

7.2.2.6. Subject Matter Expert (SME)/POC for further information.

7.2.3. SII(s) will be of limited duration (generally not to exceed 90 days).

7.2.4. SII(s) may be issued/rescinded from the HAF, MAJCOM, NAF or unit level. If issued from agencies outside the MAJCOMs (e.g., HAF, HQ Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA), but not subordinate NAFs or units), the MAJCOM Stan/Eval function will coordinate the intent and verbiage of the SII in order to determine the level of applicability prior to release.

7.2.5. Units will place all applicable SIIs into the CIF, Current Read File, Part B, for dissemination to crewmembers.

7.2.6. All current MDS-Specific and Cockpit/Crew Resource Management (CRM)/Operational Risk Management (ORM) related SII(s) will be briefed during mission briefings for the duration of the SII(s). Mission-specific SII(s) need only be briefed on those missions for which the SII is relevant.

**7.3. Go/No-Go Procedures.** Units will establish a positive control system that ensures cybercrew members have completed all training and Stan/Eval items required for missions. Units will provide guidance on this system in the unit operating instruction.

7.3.1. Units will utilize PEX for all Go/No-Go verification. Backup Go/No-Go procedures will be maintained to permit Go/No-Go verification procedures when information system connectivity difficulties are experienced. **(T-2).**

7.3.2. Units will verify ACC Form 4418 are valid and/or current for the planned training or mission profile.

7.3.3. Units using the Letters of Certifications (LOX) to track and document the listing of certifications will develop local processes to ensure it is accurate and complete IAW locally directed certifications and ACCMAN17-2(MDS) volumes 1. **(T-2).**

7.3.4. An initial review and certification of all CIF volumes will be accomplished prior to an individual's first mission. Cybercrew members on extensive absence from operations (90 days or more) will accomplish a complete review of all volumes and messages prior to mission. **(T-3).**

7.3.5. Use the Go/No-Go procedures to document the review, certification, and acknowledgment of Volume 1 Part B information by cybercrew members. Volume 1 Part C may be monitored by using Go/No Go procedures at unit discretion.

7.3.6. Units will designate person(s) to verify and alibi all cybercrew Go/No-Go status prior to releasing cybercrew members for any scheduled mission. **(T-2).**

**7.4. Supplementary Evaluations.**

7.4.1. Purpose. Supplementary evaluations are administrative tools used by a commander to ensure standardization of operations and to identify and evaluate implemented solutions to operational problems, such as negative evaluation trends. The form and content of a supplementary evaluation is at the discretion of the commander directing it.

7.4.2. Supplementary evaluations are not cybercrew qualification evaluations.

7.4.3. The commander directing the supplementary evaluation will determine the areas to be evaluated. The Stan/Eval function directly under the commander directing the supplementary evaluation will determine the method of evaluation, is responsible for administrative management of data collection, and will report results as directed by the commander.

7.4.4. Individuals other than SEEs, as determined by the commander directing the supplementary evaluation, may participate in its conduct.

7.4.5. Supplementary evaluations may be administered in conjunction with a performance evaluation. If conducted during a mission, supplementary evaluations will not be all-encompassing, result in the assignment of an overall grade or be documented on an ACC Form 4418.

7.4.6. At a minimum, supplementary evaluations results will be documented in SEB minutes (see [Attachment 2](#)).

## Chapter 8

### DOCUMENTATION

**8.1. Scope.** Administration of the cybercrew qualification evaluation requires accurate documentation. The qualifications for which a cybercrew member is to be evaluated are determined from the unit certification document.

8.1.1. The results of cybercrew evaluations are recorded on the ACC Form 4418. The chronological history of evaluations for a cybercrew member is recorded on an ACC Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualifications*. These AF Forms are maintained in the CEF.

8.1.2. In all instances of documentation, use of electronic forms is authorized, to include use of electronic signatures and wholly electronic CEFs. In all instances, computer-generated forms must mirror AF Form as published on the USAF e-Publishing web site.

**8.2. Qualifications versus Certifications.** Qualifications are attained through evaluations and documented on the ACC Form 4418, as applicable. Certifications are attained through methods other than evaluation (e.g., mission commander certifications, upgrades) and may be documented on a unit certification document signed by an authorized official.

### **8.3. ACC Form 4418, Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification.**

8.3.1. Purpose. The ACC Form 4418 is the source document used to record and verify the qualification of a cybercrew member. The AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification* is an equivalent aircrew document that is approved for use in PEX for cybercrew.

8.3.1.1. Use the ACC Form 4418 to record cybercrew qualification in a single weapon system.

8.3.1.2. Completion of an ACC Form 4418 is accomplished by four individuals: the SEE, a Reviewing Officer, a Final Approving Officer, and the examinee.

8.3.2. General Data Entry. See [Attachment 3](#) for sample ACC Forms 4418.

8.3.2.1. In all instances of data entry, if an electronic form is used, the format required by the electronic form will be used (see also [paragraph 8.1.2](#)).

8.3.2.2. For date fields use a two-digit day, three-letter month and two-digit year format (e.g., 24 Jun 12).

8.3.2.3. The Eligibility Period and Expiration Date of Qualification blocks will use a three-letter month and two-digit year format (e.g., Jun 12).

8.3.2.4. Except where specifically noted otherwise (e.g., annotating the type evaluation, INSTRl), use upper and lower case letters.

8.3.2.5. Requirements for font, indentation, and justification (right, left or centered) of data are not specified.

8.3.3. Date Completed.

8.3.3.1. Use the latest completion date of the evaluation requisites (non-performance/written or performance phase) or the additional training if assigned.

#### 8.3.4. - Examinee Identification.

8.3.4.1. Name, Rank (USAF-standard abbreviated or non-abbreviated rank is acceptable) and last four of Social Security Number (SSN).

#### 8.3.4.2. Organization and Location.

8.3.4.2.1. Enter the unit designation and location where the examinee is assigned/attached for performing mission (actual unit/office symbol will be annotated IAW [paragraph 8.3.6.4](#)).

8.3.4.2.2. For FTU courses in which an evaluation is administered, the organization and location will reflect the FTU organization/location.

#### 8.3.4.3. Weapon System/Crew Position.

8.3.4.3.1. Enter the MDS in which the evaluation was given.

8.3.4.3.2. Enter the examinee's highest qualification reflecting the intention of the evaluation in that particular MDS. **Note:** Examiner (e.g., Evaluator, EC) is not a qualification, it is a certification, and should only be entered when the SEE is receiving a SPOT SEE Objectivity evaluation.

8.3.4.3.3. Each evaluation for the cybercrew holding multiple MDSs and/or crew positions qualification will be documents on a separate ACC Form 4418.

#### 8.3.4.4. Eligibility Period.

8.3.4.4.1. Enter the 6-month period preceding the expiration date from the last similar periodic cybercrew qualification evaluation (e.g., if the last MSN evaluation expires Sep 12, enter Apr-Sep 12).

8.3.4.4.2. Enter N/A (not applicable) for INIT, SPOT, RQ, and out-of-the-eligibility period evaluations (see [paragraph 5.8.3](#)).

8.3.4.4.3. For periodic evaluations where the evaluation expiration date of the previous evaluation is extended under the provisions of [paragraph 5.8.3.2](#), enter the 6-month period preceding the original expiration date (SQ/CCs extend only the expiration date, not the eligibility period).

8.3.4.4.4. Dual entries are authorized for misaligned combined evaluations (e.g., if last INSTR evaluation expires Nov 12 and QUAL evaluation expires Jan 13, enter "INSTR: Jun-Nov 12/QUAL: Aug 12-Jan 13" for an INSTR/QUAL evaluation).

#### 8.3.5. Qualification.

##### 8.3.5.1. Non-Performance/Written Phase.

##### 8.3.5.1.1. Examination/Check.

8.3.5.1.1.1. Make a separate entry for each non-performance/written requisite exam/evaluation. Discrepancies will be noted in the examiner's remarks (see [paragraph 8.3.7.3.3](#)).

8.3.5.1.1.2. If requisites exceed available lines, make combined entries or document additional requisite completion in the Comments section.



8.3.5.1.1.3. Annotate an EPE as 1, 2, or 3 regardless of whether all or a portion of the EPE was discussed/performed.

8.3.5.1.1.4. Annotate “EPEs” as required by the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2.

8.3.5.1.2. Date. In the date column, enter the date that the requisite is successfully completed. Enter the requal (EPE)/reexam (test/CAPs) date if a requal/reexam was required.

8.3.5.1.3. Grade.

8.3.5.1.3.1. Enter failed exam score with a successfully completed reexam as follows: 84/98.

8.3.5.1.3.2. Enter failed CAPs with successful re-accomplishment as follows: U/Q.

8.3.5.1.3.3. Separate CAPs grades from other requisite examination grades when on the same line by enclosing them in parentheses as follows: 84/98 (U/Q).

8.3.5.1.3.4. Enter failed EPE grades with a successful requal as follows: 3/1.

8.3.5.2. Performance Phase.

8.3.5.2.1. Mission/Check.

8.3.5.2.1.1. IAW [paragraph 5.2](#), use the following designations to describe the purpose of the evaluation(s): QUAL, MSN, INSTR, or SPOT. If combined, include the designation of each evaluation (e.g., QUAL/MSN, QUAL/MSN).

8.3.5.2.1.2. Use the following prefixes, when applicable, to describe the type of evaluation: INIT, RQ, N/N and/or SIM. More than one prefix may be used to describe an evaluation as outlined in [paragraph 5.2.5](#).

8.3.5.2.1.2.1. The only annotations of INSTR used are INIT INSTR and RQ INSTR as described in [paragraph 5.2.3](#).

8.3.5.2.1.2.2. INSTR will not be used for periodic evaluations as the ACC Form 4418 weapon system/crew position is already annotated with the instructor designation (e.g., IXX).

8.3.5.2.1.2.3. When requalification deals with regaining a complete loss of instructor qualification, document it as RQ INSTR (not RQ SPOT).

8.3.5.2.1.3. Make a single line entry to document the performance(s)/event(s) used to complete the evaluation.

8.3.5.2.1.4. Make multiple single line entries for each mission/event if two or more missions/events are required and administered by either different SEEs or on separate days.

8.3.5.2.1.5. Where a single mission (such as DCO tasking) consists of multiple missions over one or more days with the same SEE, a single line entry may be used.

8.3.5.2.2. Date.

8.3.5.2.2.1. Enter the date the mission/event was completed.

8.3.5.2.2.2. For evaluations where a single mission consists of multiple sorties over one or more days (see [paragraph 8.3.5.2.1.5](#)), enter the inclusive dates of the sortie(s). Document the details IAW [paragraph 8.3.7.3.2](#).

8.3.5.2.2.3. For evaluations conducted on missions consisting of a single sortie spanning more than one day (e.g., began at 2300hrs and concluded at 0100), use a single line entry with the date the mission was completed. Document the details IAW [paragraph 8.3.7.3.2](#).

#### 8.3.5.3. Qualification Level.

8.3.5.3.1. Annotate the examinee's overall qualification level IAW the definitions of [paragraph 5.3.3](#) by placing a "1" (for Q1) or "2" (for Q2) in the qualified block or a "3" (for Q3) in the unqualified block.

8.3.5.3.2. Combined evaluations (e.g., QUAL/MSN) require only one grade if all evaluations were awarded the same overall level.

8.3.5.3.2.1. If the overall level varies for each type of evaluation accomplished, indicate the qualification level for each part separately (e.g., "MSN: 1" in the qualified block and "INSTR: 3" in the unqualified block).

#### 8.3.5.4. Expiration Date of Qualification.

8.3.5.4.1. IAW [paragraph 5.8.1](#) for evaluations that establish a new eligibility period, enter the month and year that is 17 months after the month in which the performance phase of the evaluation was successfully completed.

8.3.5.4.2. For evaluations that do not establish a new eligibility period, enter "N/A."

8.3.5.4.3. Combined evaluations require only one date if all parts of the evaluation were successfully completed and/or "N/A" if all parts were assigned an unqualified grade.

8.3.5.4.3.1. For combined evaluations where one component is successfully completed and/or one component is assigned an unqualified grade, indicate by assigning a new expiration date for those portions completed successfully, and —N/A for those portions awarded an unqualified grade (e.g., MSN 1 and INSTR 3, then enter "MSN - Jul 12" under Qualified and "INSTR-N/A" under Unqualified).

8.3.5.5. Additional Training. If additional training not required, annotate each of the blocks described below with "N/A."

##### 8.3.5.5.1. Due Date(s).

8.3.5.5.1.1. Enter a date not to exceed the last day of the third month following the event requiring additional training (e.g., 26 Jan 12 Eval, 30 Apr 12 due date).

8.3.5.5.1.2. If more than one date is required, preface the due dates with EPE or PFM (for performance) as appropriate.

##### 8.3.5.5.2. Date Additional Training Completed.

8.3.5.5.2.1. Enter the date(s) the examinee completed additional training,

otherwise, enter “N/A.”

8.3.5.5.2.2. If more than one date is required, preface the date completed with EPE or PFM, as appropriate.

8.3.5.5.3. Certifying Instructor. The instructor who completed the additional training (or final event if more than one instructor is used) will sign as the Certifying Official.

8.3.5.6. Restrictions/Exceptionally Qualified/Commander-Directed Downgrade. Place an “X” in the appropriate block when comments are annotated in Section IV. Do not annotate for restrictions resulting from failed requisite exams.

### 8.3.6. Certification Signatures.

#### 8.3.6.1. Examiner.

8.3.6.1.1. The SEE signing Section III of the ACC Form 4418:

8.3.6.1.1.1. Is responsible for the content of the ACC Form 4418, and will not sign Section III until verifying all required items (IAW this publication and ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2) are documented.

8.3.6.1.1.2. Will always place an “X” in the remarks block and make comments in the comments block.

8.3.6.1.2. If two or more missions are required to complete an evaluation, only the SEE completing the evaluation will sign Section III, any other evaluator(s) will enter remarks in the Mission Description block describing those parts of the performance evaluation they evaluated and sign a signature block immediately adjacent to their remarks (see examples in [Attachment 3](#)).

#### 8.3.6.2. Reviewing and Final Approving Officers.

8.3.6.2.1. The Reviewing and Final Approving Officers (squadron operations officer and SQ/CCs or those acting in their stead during the period of the signature process -- not necessarily the date of the evaluation) will review the content of the ACC Form 4418 and the examiner’s overall assessment, ensure all required additional training is adequate to correct the noted deficiencies and is complete, and will place an “X” in the “Concur” block.

8.3.6.2.1.1. If either or both officers do not agree with any portion of the ACC Form 4418, the overall grade will not be changed, but the dissenting officer will place an “X” in the “Do Not Concur” block on his/her line of the ACC Form 4418. Remarks will not be modified without the concurrence of the individual who entered the original comments.

8.3.6.2.1.2. If “Do Not Concur” is marked, the non-concurring officer(s) will provide justification (e.g., reason for non-concurrence, suggested modifications to additional training as recommended by the examiner) IAW [paragraph 8.3.7.4](#) and/or [paragraph 8.3.7.5](#).

8.3.6.2.2. The Reviewing Officer will sign and date the ACC Form 4418 after the SEE, but prior to the Final Approval Officer.

8.3.6.2.3. The Final Approval Officer will sign and date the ACC Form 4418 after the Reviewing Officer but prior to the examinee. As applicable, the Final Approving Officer may recommend or give a commander-directed downgrade IAW [paragraph 5.9](#) if further action is warranted.

8.3.6.2.4. For evaluations completed at formal course FTU locations, the reviewing and final approving officers will be assigned to the FTU.

8.3.6.2.5. Squadron commanders will review and OG commanders will approve evaluations given by or taken by the operations officer. **(T-2)**.

8.3.6.2.6. Squadron operations officers will review and OG commanders will approve, evaluations given by or taken by the Squadron commander. **(T-2)**.

8.3.6.3. Organization Block Format. The format and content of data for the Organization block for the examiner and reviewing and final approving officers will be as follows:

8.3.6.3.1. Examiner. Annotate unit/organization and office symbol of the examiner that completed the evaluation (e.g., 26 NOS/DOV, 16 AF/OV, MAJCOM/A3T or equivalent).

8.3.6.3.2. Reviewing and Final Approving Officers. Annotate unit/organization and office symbol (e.g., 33 NWS/DO, 26 COG/CC, 688 CW/CC).

8.3.6.4. Examinee. The examinee will sign and date after the Final Approving Officer certifying that they have been debriefed and understand the action(s) being taken. Annotate unit/organization and office symbol in the Typed Name and Grade block (e.g., MAJCOM/A3T or equivalent, 67 COG/OGV).

8.3.7. Comments.

8.3.7.1. Restrictions (if required).

8.3.7.1.1. Specific restrictions and the criteria for the removal of the restrictions will be documented as the first item of Section IV.

8.3.7.1.2. Document each restriction by annotating the specific restriction, level of supervision required, and criteria for removal of the restriction.

8.3.7.1.3. Restrictions associated with failed requisite examinations will not be documented on the ACC Form 4418.

8.3.7.2. EQ Designation (when used). Enter designation in all capital letters. Document justification (e.g., areas of excellence) before Examiner's Remarks. Do not use Officer Performance Report (OPR)/Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) style statements (e.g., stratification). See examples in [Attachment 3](#).

8.3.7.3. Examiner Remarks.

8.3.7.3.1. General. For evaluations requiring two or more sorties, the mission description will be annotated with First Sortie, Second Sortie, etc., as applicable.

8.3.7.3.1.1. First Sortie, Second Sortie, etc. entries on subsequent paragraphs/subparagraphs will be annotated only if there are discrepancies or recommended additional training.

8.3.7.3.1.2. In all instances, except for the mission description, if no verbiage is needed annotate with “None”.

8.3.7.3.2. Mission Description. The verbiage of the Mission Description will be IAW ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2 and will verify that the required areas for the evaluation were accomplished. Comments addressing specific areas in which instructional ability was demonstrated are mandatory for all evaluations of instructors (if the instructor taught throughout the entire mission and there were numerous areas in which instructional ability was demonstrated, one general comment will suffice).

8.3.7.3.3. Discrepancies. Document discrepancies by annotating the grading area number, grading area title (followed by any subarea title in parenthesis), grade (Q-/U), annotation if discrepancy was debriefed and synopsis of discrepancy. Associate all non-performance/written phase discrepancies under paragraph B. Discrepancies, 1. Non-Performance/Written, and all performance phase discrepancies under B. Discrepancies, 2. Performance.

8.3.7.3.4. Recommended Additional Training.

8.3.7.3.4.1. If discrepancies are documented in paragraph B and are not listed as “Debriefed”, annotate Paragraph C with recommended additional training.

8.3.7.3.4.2. Descriptions of assigned additional training will include how satisfactory knowledge or proficiency will be demonstrated to a SEE or an instructor.

8.3.7.3.4.3. If additional training items will not fit on the ACC Form 4418, at a minimum annotate the proficiency that will be required by the examinee prior to the requalification.

8.3.7.3.4.4. Performance and non-performance phase discrepancies will be listed separately. If there is no additional training, annotate paragraph C as, “Recommended Additional Training. None.”

8.3.7.3.5. Additional Comments.

8.3.7.3.5.1. Comments are restricted to significant information dealing with the evaluation not documented elsewhere.

8.3.7.3.5.2. Document any commendable items (see [paragraph 5.3.2.7](#)) under Additional Comments using the following format: Commendable followed by grading area number, grading area title (followed by any subarea title in parenthesis) and examiner’s description of commendable circumstances (see [Attachment 3](#)).

8.3.7.3.5.3. OPR/EPR-type comments or comments comparing the examinee to other individuals are prohibited.

8.3.7.3.5.4. If the performance phase grade differs from the overall qualification level, the performance phase grade will be entered in this paragraph.

8.3.7.3.5.5. If an alternate evaluation method is used to satisfy a part of the non-performance or performance phase requirements (unless always accomplished verbally, or in the simulator/CTD according to the ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2

grading criteria), enter area number, area title, reason not accomplished in the normal method, alternate evaluation method used and date.

8.3.7.3.5.6. If an individual received an overall Q3, indicate whether the entire evaluation must be reaccomplished, or just specific areas/subareas.

8.3.7.3.5.7. If the requal examiner of a non-performance phase requal is different from the initial SEE, the requal examiner will sign and date a statement under this paragraph.

8.3.7.3.5.8. IAW [paragraph 5.2.5.2.2](#), if a SPOT evaluation is used to update a periodic evaluation and/or the OG/CC authorizes additional missions after the SPOT to accomplish a periodic evaluation, document the circumstances in this section.

8.3.7.3.5.9. Incorporate the information contained in any applicable MFRs (e.g., extension, waivers) in this paragraph (see [paragraph 8.7.3.2.2](#)).

8.3.7.3.5.10. Document individual or group waivers applicable to the evaluation.

8.3.7.4. Reviewing Officer's Remarks. Reviewing Officers will annotate their remarks following the Examiner's Remarks in the space provided. If no remarks, annotate with "None."

8.3.7.5. Approving Officer's Remarks. Approving Officers will annotate their remarks following the Reviewing Officer Remarks in the space provided. If no remarks, annotate with "None."

8.3.7.6. Additional Reviews (Optional). Additional reviews are at MAJCOM/unit discretion and will be defined in the unit supplement, if used.

### 8.3.8. Temporary Evaluation Documentation.

8.3.8.1. File temporary evaluation documentation, ACC Form 4418, in the cybercrew member's CEF after all evaluation requirements are complete (i.e., all non-performance/written and performance requisites) as a temporary record of the performance evaluation results.

8.3.8.2. The temporary evaluation documentation will include examinee, examiner, type evaluation, qualification level, requisites results, and date completed. List any discrepancies by area/subarea, any restrictions, any additional training and any additional training due dates.

8.3.8.3. The examiner completing the evaluation will sign and date the temporary evaluation documentation.

8.3.8.4. Remove temporary evaluation documentation when the permanent ACC Form 4418 is filed in the CEF.

8.3.8.5. File the completed ACC Form 4418 in the CEF no later than the end of the third month following the date completed annotated on the ACC Form 4418.

8.3.8.6. Units may use PEX printed versions as a hard copy temporary record.

### 8.3.9. Requals

#### 8.3.9.1. Performance Requals

8.3.9.1.1. Use a separate ACC Form 4418 from the Q3 ACC Form 4418 for performance phase requals.

8.3.9.1.2. The requal ACC Form 4418 will only include documentation of the performance phase evaluation, Requisite completion dates from the Q3 ACC Form 4418 will not be annotated on the requal form unless requisites were not completed or are required to complete the requal.

8.3.9.1.3. If the performance requal is completed prior to completion of required requisites, delay completion of the ACC Form 4418 until requisites are complete and enter the requisites on the requal ACC Form 4418.

#### 8.3.9.2. Non-Performance/Written Requals.

8.3.9.2.1. A non-performance/written requal will be documented on the Q3 ACC Form 4418 that generated it.

8.3.9.2.2. Except as described below, the ACC Form 4418 will be documented as described in paragraphs [8.3.4](#) through [8.3.7](#).

8.3.9.2.2.1. Date Completed. Use the latest completion date (non-performance/written requisite or successful non-performance/written requal) of the evaluation.

8.3.9.2.2.2. Performance Phase. Document the date of the non-performance/written requal on a separate line as “NP REQUAL” below the performance evaluation entry under Performance Phase.

8.3.9.2.2.3. Qualification Level. Annotate the overall qualification level as “3/1” in the qualified block.

8.3.9.2.2.4. The SEE that completed the performance evaluation (i.e. the one that gave the overall Q3) will sign the front of the ACC Form 4418. If the requal examiner is different than the performance examiner that gave the Q3, the requal examiner will sign and date an appropriate statement in Section IV - Comments, Examiner’s Remarks (see [paragraph 8.3.7.3](#)).

**8.4. Commander-Directed Downgrade.** (see also [paragraph 5.9](#)). Except as described below, the ACC Form 4418 for a Commander-directed Downgrade will be IAW [paragraph 8.3](#).

8.4.1. Date Completed. The effective date of the downgrade. This is the date the commander initiated the downgrade action. If this is a result of a downgrade for non-performance related issues, the date the commander mandated the downgrade action will be used.

#### 8.4.2. Examinee Identification.

8.4.2.1. Weapon System/Crew Position. In addition to the cybercrew member’s MDS, if the downgrade includes a loss of a qualification (e.g., MCC) enter the downgraded crew position. If the individual is downgraded to a completely unqualified status, enter the crew position to which he/she will be re-qualified upon successful completion of either an RQ evaluation or non-performance/written requal.

8.4.2.2. Eligibility Period. Enter “N/A”.



### 8.4.3. Qualification.

8.4.3.1. Performance Phase. In the Mission/Check block enter the type evaluation commensurate with the downgrade being given (e.g., if the commander is downgrading an area/subarea related to the tactical mission of the weapon system, then enter MSN) with the date of the situation that caused the downgrade.

#### 8.4.3.2. Qualification Level.

8.4.3.2.1. If the commander does not intend to reduce the qualification(s) of the individual and is issuing a downgrade in a non-critical area/subarea (i.e., a Q- in one or more non-critical areas/subareas), then enter “2”.

8.4.3.2.2. If the commander intends either to remove a qualification (e.g., instructor), or reduce the individual to a completely unqualified status, then enter “3”.

8.4.3.2.2.1. Normally, requal evaluations following a commander directed downgrade are documented on a separate ACC Form 4418 IAW [paragraph 8.3.9.1](#).

8.4.3.2.2.2. If the commander intends for the individual to regain their qualification through a non-performance/written requal, enter “3/1” (see [paragraph 8.3.9.2](#)).

8.4.3.3. Expiration Date of Qualification. Enter “N/A”.

#### 8.4.3.4. Restriction(s) and Additional Training Due Date.

8.4.3.4.1. If a “2” is entered in the Qualification Level IAW guidance above, restrictions and additional training are not required.

8.4.3.4.1.1. Leave the box for Restriction(s) unmarked and enter “N/A” for Due Dates and “N/A” for Date Additional Training Completed.

8.4.3.4.1.2. If desired, the commander may still recommend restrictions and/or additional training. If used, document IAW the next paragraph.

8.4.3.4.2. If a “3” is entered in the Qualification Level, restrictions and additional training are required.

8.4.3.4.2.1. Place an “X” in the box for Restriction(s) and enter the Due Date as the last day of the third month from the effective date (i.e. the date entered into “Date Completed” at the top of the ACC Form 4418.

8.4.3.4.2.2. Enter a date into the Date Additional Training Completed block when required training is complete.

8.4.3.4.2.3. The Instructor completing the additional training (or last training event if more than one) will sign and date the Certified Instructor block.

8.4.3.5. Commander-Directed Downgrade Block. Place an “X”.

### 8.4.4. Certification Signatures.

8.4.4.1. Only the commander directing the downgrade and the individual concerned will sign the ACC Form 4418. Additional reviews (annotated under Section IV) are at the MAJCOM discretion.



8.4.4.2. Final Approving Officer. The commander directing the downgrade will sign and place an “X” in the remarks block.

8.4.4.3. Examinee. The crewmember will sign acknowledging the action being taken by the commander.

8.4.5. Comments.

8.4.5.1. At the top of the page enter, “RESTRICTIONS: COMMANDER-DIRECTED DOWNGRADE.”

8.4.5.2. Paragraph A, Narrative: Describe the reason for the commander directed downgrade. Include “for cause” in the reasoning statement for all performance-related cases, but for non-performance cases enter only if due to disciplinary/adverse administrative action (e.g., Article 15).

8.4.5.3. Paragraph B, Discrepancies.

8.4.5.3.1. Non-performance cases: “None”.

8.4.5.3.2. Performance-related cases: IAW [paragraph 8.3.7.3.3](#).

8.4.5.4. Paragraph C, Recommended Additional Training.

8.4.5.4.1. Non-performance cases (not required): As desired or “None”.

8.4.5.4.2. Performance-related cases IAW [paragraph 8.4.3.2.1](#) (not required): As desired or “None”.

8.4.5.4.3. Performance-related cases IAW [paragraph 8.4.3.2.2](#) (required): Enter corrective action or training required prior to requalification.

8.4.5.5. Paragraph D, Additional Comments: As desired or “None”.

8.4.5.6. Additional Reviews: As directed by MAJCOM and/or unit supplement or “None”.

**8.5. Initial Cadre.** (see also [paragraph 5.12](#)). Except as described below, the ACC Form 4418 for an Initial Cadre will be completed IAW [paragraph 8.3](#).

8.5.1. Date Completed. The effective date as annotated on the MAJCOM/A3 memo described in [paragraph 5.11.2](#).

8.5.2. Examinee Identification.

8.5.2.1. Weapon System /Crew Position. Enter the cybercrew member’s new MDS and crew position.

8.5.2.2. Eligibility Period. Enter “N/A”.

8.5.3. Qualification.

8.5.3.1. Performance Phase. In the Mission/Check block enter “INIT CADRE QUAL” with the same date as noted in [paragraph 8.5.1](#).

8.5.3.2. Qualification Level. Enter a “1” in the qualified block.

8.5.3.3. Expiration Date of Qualification. Enter expiration date.

8.5.3.4. Additional Training Due Date. Leave blank

#### 8.5.4. Certification Signatures.

8.5.4.1. Examiner. Leave blank.

8.5.4.2. Reviewing Officer. The SQ/CC (or equivalent) will sign and place an “X” in the remarks block. If the SQ/CC is being upgraded then leave blank.

8.5.4.3. Final Approving Officer. The OG/CC (or equivalent) will sign and place an “X” in the remarks block.

8.5.4.4. Examinee. The crewmember will sign.

#### 8.5.5. Comments.

8.5.5.1. Paragraph A, Narrative. Include a brief description of the new qualification as well as any training received before awarding qualification. Reference the MAJCOM/A3 memo described in [paragraph 5.11.2](#).

**8.6. ACC Form 4420, *Individual’s Record of Duties and Qualifications*.** The ACC Form 4420 is an index providing pertinent information extracted from all the ACC Form 4418 accomplished by the cybercrew member. The AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation* is an equivalent aircrew document that is approved for use in PEX for cybercrew.

#### 8.6.1. Data Entry.

8.6.1.1. Except where specifically noted otherwise (e.g., annotating the type evaluation, “INSTR”), use upper and lower case letters.

8.6.1.2. Requirements for font, indentation, and justification (right, left or centered) of data are not specified.

8.6.1.3. A one-line entry is used for all evaluations with the exception of those in which the qualification levels awarded on portions of a combined evaluation are not all the same.

8.6.1.4. For combined evaluations in which different qualification levels are awarded for any of the portions, a single line entry will be made for each different qualification level awarded indicating which portions of the combined evaluation received that qualification level.

8.6.1.5. Use each ACC Form 4420 until it is completely filled. If additional blocks not needed, “Z” out any unused blocks.

8.6.2. Item No. Enter chronological item number (e.g., 1, 2, 3).

8.6.3. Date. Use the event completion date in YYYY, MM, DD format.

8.6.4. Action To Be Recorded. Enter the event to be recorded to include the type of evaluation, MDS used and crew position performed during the evaluation as it appears in the Wpn Sys/Crew Position area under Examinee Identification of the subject ACC Form 4418.

8.6.5. Score/Rate. Enter the appropriate qualification level as it appears on the subject ACC Form 4418.

8.6.6. Signature. Signature of official who conducted the event.

8.6.7. MAJCOM Change. A one-line, undated entry containing MAJCOM title will be made for each change in the individual’s MAJCOM based on a PCS/Permanent Change of

Assignment (PCA). Do not annotate a change of MAJCOM if the individual is receiving an evaluation from an evaluator in a different MAJCOM unless the individual is enrolled in a formal training program.

8.6.8. Computer Generated ACC Form 4420. A computer generated ACC Form 4420 may be used as long as cumulative entries are retained. Electronic copies of the ACC Form 4420 should be forwarded with the CEF when the individual moves to a new squadron.

**8.7. CEF.** The CEF contains the source documents that constitute the history of cyber qualifications for each cybercrew member.

8.7.1. Maintenance.

8.7.1.1. Each cybercrew member who is on mission status must have a CEF that includes all ACC Form 4418, ACC Form 4420, and any additional MAJCOM and/or unit specified items.

8.7.1.2. The CEF must be maintained by a Stan/Eval functional office - normally in the organization to which the individual is assigned or attached for performing missions.

8.7.1.3. HHQ personnel on mission status may have their CEFs maintained by the Stan/Eval function of the unit to which they are attached for performing missions.

8.7.1.4. Individuals assigned or attached to other than USAF units may use the format of the service to which they are attached to document their history of qualifications.

8.7.2. Electronic CEFs.

8.7.2.1. For electronic CEFs, any hard copy historical information (once incorporated into the electronic CEF system) will be archived with the Stan/Eval function that maintains the CEFs. Archive method will be at unit discretion.

8.7.2.2. Scanned versions of historical documents will be saved IAW AFI33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*.

8.7.2.3. Electronic CEF systems must be able to produce hard copies of CEF products, when needed, consistent with the guidance in this publication. Additionally, the electronic CEF must be transportable.

8.7.2.4. Units will convert and maintain all CEFs in electronic format using PEX. Units must establish a viable backup system in the form of either a printed hard copy or soft copy that can be viewed if the primary system is down or lost. **(T-2)**.

8.7.3. Contents. Divide the CEF into two sections:

8.7.3.1. [left side]. This Section contains ACC Form 4420, and any items authorized by the MAJCOM and/or unit supplement. Section I may contain two sub-sections.

8.7.3.1.1. ACC Form 4420 will be placed on top in chronological order with the most recent on top.

8.7.3.1.2. Any additional information as directed by MAJCOM and/or unit supplement will be placed under the ACC Form 4420.

8.7.3.2. [right side]. This Section contains ACC Form 4418 and any related MFRs for all evaluations listed on the ACC Form 4420.

8.7.3.2.1. ACC Form 4418. File ACC Form 4418 in chronological order with the most recent on top. Individuals who maintain qualification in two or more MDSs or two or more crew positions in the same MDS will file ACC Form 4418 in chronological order – without consideration of MDS or crew position.

8.7.3.2.2. MFRs.

8.7.3.2.2.1. MFRs documenting extensions, and/or unusual circumstances to potentially be included in an ACC Form 4418 are filed on top of the affected ACC Form 4418.

8.7.3.2.2.1.1. Incorporate the information contained in the MFR onto the applicable ACC Form 4418 under Examiner Remarks paragraph D, Additional Comments, when action is complete.

8.7.3.2.2.1.2. Once MFR information is incorporated onto the ACC Form 4418, remove the MFR from the CEF.

8.7.3.2.2.2. Expiration Date Extensions (see also [paragraph 5.8.3.2](#)).

8.7.3.2.2.2.1. On the expiration date extension MFR specify extension authority, the new expiration date, and a brief description of the extension.

8.7.3.2.2.2.2. MFRs will be dated prior to the expiration date of any affected periodic evaluation.

8.7.3.2.2.3. Permanent MFRs. MFRs become a permanent part of the CEF only when a Major discrepancy addressed by the MFR is not addressed or corrected by a later ACC Form 4418 (see [paragraph 8.7.6.1](#)) or an unusual circumstance cannot be documented any other way.

8.7.4. Hard-Copy Folders.

8.7.4.1. Folders must be letter size, able to separate contents into two sections and constructed of heavy stock (recommend press board folder or equivalent).

8.7.4.2. Standard 2 ¾-inch metal fasteners may be used.

8.7.4.3. Affix a label bearing the individual's name and DoD ID number to the inside back cover so that the folder may be identified when filed. Include additional information on the label if required by MAJCOM and/or unit supplement.

8.7.4.4. Folders must bear the "Controlled Unclassified Information" label/stamp on both sides of the CEF.

8.7.5. Review of CEF. Document the procedures on how to accomplish an initial review and how to implement the periodic review of CEFs.

8.7.5.1. Initial Review. The initial/gaining unit will review the CEF for all newly assigned cybercrew members to verify their qualification(s) prior to their first mission.

8.7.5.1.1. The reviewing organization is responsible for establishing the qualification of the cybercrew member as determined from the latest applicable documentation in Sections I and II of the CEF.

8.7.5.1.2. Following the initial review, the unit maintaining the CEF is responsible only for documentation subsequently placed in the CEF.

8.7.5.1.3. If the CEF of HHQ personnel on active mission status is maintained by the Stan/Eval function at the unit/squadron to which they are attached to perform mission, the Stan/Eval function of that unit/squadron will also review the CEF prior to their first mission.

#### 8.7.5.2. Posting Review.

8.7.5.2.1. The Stan/Eval function will review each ACC Form 4418 and ACC Form 4420 when they are placed in the CEF to ensure accuracy and completeness.

8.7.5.2.2. The ACC Form 4418 review will confirm that the eligibility period and qualification as documented are correct, all required performance evaluation events and requisites were accomplished within the eligibility period and that all signatures and initials are obtained within the allotted time (see [paragraph 8.3.8.5](#)).

8.7.5.2.3. Document the posting review IAW MAJCOM and/or unit supplement.

#### 8.7.5.3. Periodic Review.

8.7.5.3.1. The Stan/Eval function will review all applicable CEFs to confirm expiration dates used to track required cybercrew qualification evaluations are the same as those listed in the CEFs. Periodic review of CEFs for personnel in inactive status is not required.

8.7.5.3.2. The interval between reviews will not exceed the standard qualification period window unless a more restrictive review period is established by the MAJCOM and/or unit supplement.

8.7.5.3.3. Document the periodic review IAW MAJCOM and/or unit supplement.

8.7.6. CEF Discrepancies. CEF Discrepancies include those of the ACC Form 4418, ACC Form 4420, and any MAJCOM-directed documentation.

8.7.6.1. Major Discrepancies. Discrepancies that affect the qualification of the affected cybercrew member.

8.7.6.1.1. Major discrepancies are documented on a permanent MFR filed in Section I or II immediately above the affected ACC Form 4418, or in chronological order for items other than those found on ACC Form 4418.

8.7.6.1.2. MFRs documenting similar major discrepancies found on multiple ACC Form 4418 will be filed on top of the latest affected ACC Form 4418.

8.7.6.2. Minor Discrepancies. Discrepancies that do not affect the qualification of the affected cybercrew member (e.g., typos, formatting and misspellings).

8.7.6.2.1. Minor discrepancies are documented on a non-permanent record as defined by the MAJCOM or unit supplement to this instruction and need not reside in the CEF.

8.7.6.3. Corrections.

8.7.6.3.1. ACC Form 4418. As a source document, the ACC Form 4418 may be corrected by use of white-out or pen and ink alteration of the original document

provided the examiner signing Section III of the form initials the correction. If the original SEE is not available then document the discrepancy IAW paragraphs **8.7.6.1** or **8.7.6.2**. When the original SEE is not available, OGV Chiefs may also correct minor discrepancies.

8.7.6.3.2. ACC Form 4420. ACC Form 4420, not being source documents, may be altered without restriction to reflect the assignment of the affected cybercrew member and the contents of the CEF.

8.7.6.3.3. Electronic Corrections. If the system used to store the record does not allow corrections to be made, then document the discrepancy IAW **paragraph 8.7.6.1** and/or **paragraph 8.7.6.2**.

#### 8.7.7. Transfer of CEF.

8.7.7.1. Retention of Records. Retain all records in the CEF until reviewed by the gaining unit. After review, return to the individual those forms not retained in the CEF.

8.7.7.2. Formal Training Graduates. For Formal Training School graduates reporting directly to an overseas command for a short tour, retain formal training school records for transfer to the subsequent gaining unit.

8.7.7.3. PCS of Individual. Cybercrew members will normally hand-carry their CEF to the gaining organization. Members may also hand carry electronic copies or ownership of electronic database records may be transferred to the gaining organization.

8.7.7.3.1. When circumstances prevent this, the losing organization will mail the folder to the gaining unit via registered mail.

8.7.7.3.2. Mail any records not included in the CEF to the gaining organization with clear identification of the individual concerned.

8.7.7.3.3. When mailing a CEF or any of its contents, retain a copy (hard or soft copy is acceptable) until the gaining organization has received the original CEF.

#### 8.7.8. Disposition of CEF.

8.7.8.1. Dispose of the cybercrew CEF according to the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule and Air Force guidance concerning the protection of Personally Identifiable Information.

8.7.8.2. Outdated certification documents and miscellaneous documentation identified during reviews will be returned to the cybercrew member for disposal.

MARK H. SLOCUM, Maj Gen, USAF  
Director of Operations

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

10 USC, *Armed Forces*, 10 August 1956  
32 USC §§ 101(d)(6) and 502(f) *Required Drills and Field Exercises*, 10 August 1956  
37 USC, *Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services*  
ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*, 12 January 2021  
ACCI 17-202, Volume 3, *Cyber Operations Procedures*, 12 January 2021  
AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, 23 March 2020  
AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*, 10 March 2020  
AFI 90-201, *The Air Force Inspection System*, 20 November 2018  
AFI 90-1001, *Total Force Associations (TFAS)*, 22 June 2020  
DAFI 36-2670, *Total Force Development*, 25 June 2020  
DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Process and Procedures*, 15 April 2022  
DAFPD 17-2, *Cyberspace Warfare Operations*, 27 October 2020  
DoD, 5400.11-R, *Department of Defense Privacy Program*, 14 May 2007  
TO 00-5-1, *The Air Force Technical Order System*, 15 February 2019

***Prescribed Forms***

ACC Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification*

***Adopted Forms***

ACC Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualification*  
AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*  
AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation*  
DAF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

***Abbreviations and Acronyms***

**A3**—*Director of Operation*  
**ACCSUP**—*Air Combat Command Supplement*  
**AF**—*Air Force*  
**AFFSA**—*Air Force Flight Safety Agency*  
**AFI**—*Air Force Instruction*  
**AFMAN**—*Air Force Manual*

**AFPD**—*Air Force Policy Directive*  
**AFRC**—*Air Force Reserve Command*  
**AGR**—*Active Guard and Reserve*  
**ANG**—*Air National Guard*  
**ARC**—*Air Reserve Component*  
**ART**—*Air Reserve Technician*  
**AT**—*Air Technician*  
**BMC**—*Basic Mission Capable*  
**CAP**—*Critical Action Procedure*  
**CC**—*Commander*  
**CEF**—*Cyber Evaluation Folder*  
**CIF**—*Cybercrew Information File*  
**CMR**—*Combat Mission Ready*  
**COG/CC**—*Cyber Operations Group*  
**CRF**—*Cyber Record Folder*  
**CRM**—*Cockpit/Crew Resource Management*  
**CTD**—*Cybercrew Training Device*  
**DAFPD**—*Department of the Air Force Policy Directive*  
**DCO**—*Defensive Cyberspace Operations*  
**DO**—*Director of Operations*  
**DOC**—*Designed Operational Capability*  
**DRU**—*Direct Reporting Unit*  
**EOC**—*End of Course*  
**EP**—*Emergency Procedures*  
**EPE**—*Emergency Procedures Evaluation*  
**EPR**—*Enlisted Performance Report*  
**EQ**—*Exceptionally Qualified*  
**ESAP**—*Evaluation Standardization Assessment Program*  
**ETCA**—*Education and Training Course Announcement*  
**FAM**—*Functional Area Manager*  
**FTU**—*Formal Training Unit*  
**HAF**—*Headquarters Air Force*



**HHQ**—*Higher Headquarters*  
**IAW**—*In Accordance With*  
**MCC**—*Mission Crew Commander*  
**IG**—*Inspector General*  
**INIT**—*Initial*  
**INSTR**—*Instructor*  
**LOX**—*Letters of Certification*  
**MAJCOM**—*Major Command*  
**MDS**—*Mission Design Series*  
**MFR**—*Memorandum for Record*  
**MICT**—*Management Internal Control Toolset*  
**MOA**—*Memorandum of Agreement*  
**MOU**—*Memorandum of Understanding*  
**MQF**—*Master Question File*  
**MR**—*Mission Ready*  
**MSN**—*Mission*  
**N/A**—*Not Applicable*  
**NAF**—*Numbered Air Force*  
**N-BMC**—*Non-Basic Mission Capable*  
**N-CMR**—*Non-Combat Mission Ready*  
**N-MR**—*Non-Mission Ready*  
**N/N**—*No-Notice*  
**OCR**—*Office of Collateral Responsibility*  
**OG**—*Operations Group*  
**OGV**—*Operations Group Standardization/Evaluation*  
**OPR**—*Office of Primary Responsibility*  
**OPR**—*Officer Performance Report*  
**ORM**—*Operational Risk Management*  
**PCA**—*Permanent Change of Assignment*  
**PCS**—*Permanent Change of Station*  
**PEX**—*Patriot Excalibur*  
**PFM**—*Performance*

**PRU**—*Primary Reporting Unit*  
**Q**—*Qualified*  
**QUAL**—*Qualification*  
**RQ**—*Requalification*  
**SAC**—*Self-Assessment Checklist*  
**SAV**—*Staff Assistance Visit*  
**SEB**—*Standardization/Evaluation Board*  
**SEE**—*Standardization/Evaluation Examiner*  
**SELO**—*Standardization/Evaluation Liaison Officer*  
**SIB**—*Safety Investigation Board*  
**SIM**—*Simulator*  
**SME**—*Subject Matter Expert*  
**SMQ**—*Special Mission Qualification*  
**SORN**—*System of Records Notice*  
**SPINS**—*Special Instructions*  
**SQ**—*Squadron*  
**SQ/CCV**—*Squadron Standardization and Evaluation*  
**SQB**—*Secure Question Bank*  
**SII**—*Special Interest Item*  
**SSN**—*Social Security Number*  
**STAN/EVAL**—*Standardization/Evaluation*  
**TDY**—*Temporary Duty*  
**TO**—*Technical Order*  
**U**—*Unqualified*  
**UEI**—*Unit Effectiveness Inspection*  
**USAF**—*United States Air Force*  
**WG**—*Wing*

### ***Office Symbols***

**10 AF/A3V**—Tenth Air Force Standardization and Evaluation  
**ACC/A3**—Air Combat Command Director of Operations  
**ACC/A3T**—Air Combat Command Flight Operations Division  
**ACC/A3TV**—Air Combat Command Standardization and Evaluation Branch

**ACC/IG**—Air Combat Command Inspector General

**AFRC/A3OI**—Air Force Reserve Command Information Warfare Branch

**NGB A3/10**—National Guard Bureau Director of Operations

### *Terms*

**Active Guard and Reserve (AGR)**—Members of a Reserve component on active duty under Title 10 USC, *Armed Forces*; or full-time National Guard duty under 32 USC § 502, *Required Drills and Field Exercises*,(f) for a period of 180 consecutive days or more. The tour purpose is organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing or training the Reserve components according to 32 USC § 101, *Definitions* (d)(6).

**Additional Training**—Any training recommended by an examiner to remedy deficiencies identified during an evaluation that must be completed by a specific due date. This training may include self-study, non-performance based (academic/written) instruction, CTD, simulator or mission. Additional training must include demonstration of satisfactory knowledge or proficiency to an examiner, supervisor or instructor (as stipulated in the Additional Training description) to qualify as completed.

**Air Reserve Component (ARC)**—AFRC and ANG.

**Air Reserve Technician (ART)**—A civilian employee of the United States Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) who provides permanent party support to an AFRC unit and occupies an AFRC Unit Manning Document military position in the unit comparable to his or her civilian position.

**Air Technician (AT)**—A civilian employee of the Air National Guard (ANG) who provides permanent party support to an ANG unit and occupies an ANG unit manning document military position in the unit comparable to his or her civilian position.

**Certification**—Procedure used to document competency in a particular task. Not interchangeable with “qualification”, which requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Combat Mission Ready**—A combatant cybercrew member who has satisfactorily completed mission qualification training and maintains qualification and proficiency in the command or unit operational mission.

**Crew Information File (CIF)**—A collection of publications and material determined by the MAJCOM and unit as necessary for day-to-day operations.

**Cybercrew**—The total complement of cybercrew personnel responsible for the safe operation of the cyber weapon systems, or for duties essential to the accomplishment of the weapon system’s mission.

**Cyber Evaluation Folder (CEF)**—A two-part folder containing the source documents that constitute the history of cyber qualifications of each cybercrew member.

**Cybercrew Training Device (CTD)**—A training platform suitable to conduct evaluations.

**Cyberspace Support**—Any action taken to restore communications systems/equipment to operational status, to perform preventive maintenance inspections (PMI) on communications systems/equipment and/or components, or to install or remove communications systems/equipment.

**Debriefed Discrepancy**—Remedial action taken by an examiner to remedy a discrepancy noted during a performance or, if applicable, simulator evaluation (e.g., EPE conducted in the sim). This action is accomplished during debrief of the evaluation wherein the examiner 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 Examiner’s Remarks section of the ACC Form 4418 Comments.

**Eligibility Period**—The six-month period prior to the expiration date of an evaluation that includes the month in which the evaluation is due.

**Emergency Procedures Evaluation (EPE)**—A performance, CTD, sim or verbal evaluation used to evaluate emergency procedures and systems knowledge.

**Evaluation**—1) Procedure to determine the effectiveness of the performance of an instructional product or process in order to ascertain specific causes for the effectiveness or lack of it, and to make decisions appropriate to the extent of the effectiveness. 2) The review and analysis of qualitative or quantitative data obtained from design review, hardware inspection, testing or operational use of equipment.

**Education and Training Course Announcement (ETCA)**—Air Force Database, reachable through the Air Force Portal. ETCA is prescribed by DAFI 36- 2670, Total Force Development.

**Formal Training Unit (FTU)**—A unit with a primary mission to train cybercrew personnel according to approved syllabi.

**Initial Cadre**—Those personnel assigned to conduct testing of experimental, developmental, or new cyber mission capabilities for which there are no established Formal Training programs nor standardized evaluation criteria. Initial Cadre designations are appropriate through Initial Operational Capability.

**Initial Evaluation**—The first evaluation of any type for a MDS (e.g., INIT QUAL, INIT MSN, INIT INSTR).

**Instructor Evaluation**—An evaluation that initially grants instructor qualification or reestablishes instructor qualification of the examinee in a MDS (i.e., INIT INSTR and RQ INSTR) as directed in ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Volume 1.

**Master Question File (MQF)**—Question bank used to construct closed book exams. Cybercrew members have access to MQFs.

**Mission Evaluation**—Qualifies a cybercrew member to employ the member’s assigned weapon system in accomplishing the unit’s operational or DOC statement mission. Requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Mission Ready**—A non-combatant cybercrew member who has satisfactorily completed mission qualification training and maintains qualification and proficiency in the command or unit operational mission.

**No-Notice Evaluation**—An evaluation where the examinee is notified of the evaluation at or after the beginning of normal preparation for the mission.

**Non-Performance Requal**—A procedure used by an examiner to remedy an unqualified evaluation that does not entail performance or simulator demonstration on the part of the examinee.

**Office of Collateral Responsibility (OCR)**—Any headquarters, agency, or activity having coordinating functional interest in, and responsibility for, a specific action, project, plan, program or problem.

**Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR)**—Any headquarters, agency, or activity having the primary functional interest in, and responsibility for, a specific action, project, plan, program or problem.

**Operations Group Commander (ANG/AFRC)**—ANG/AFRC may use Air Operations Officer/Operations and Training Officer, if appropriate, when Operations Group Commander (OG/CC) is referenced.

**Qualification Evaluation**—Qualifies a cybercrew member to perform the duties of a particular crew position in the specified MDS. Requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Requalification Evaluation**—An evaluation administered to remedy a loss of qualification due to expiration of a required periodic evaluation, loss of currency exceeding six months (as specified in applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 1), a requal following a failed evaluation or a commander directed downgrade. Requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Requisites**—Requirements such as exams, EPEs, CAPs, etc., that have to be accomplished before an evaluation is considered complete. Requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Requal**—A subsequent evaluation used to remedy a failed evaluation. Requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Secure Question Bank (SQB)**—Questions used to construct open book examinations. Cybercrew members do not have access to the SQB.

**SEE Objectivity Evaluation**—An evaluation that certifies a new SEE to perform Stan/Eval examiner duties. SEE Objectivity Evaluations should be conducted IAW ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Volume 2.

**SPOT Evaluation**—An evaluation other than one used to satisfy the requirements of a periodic, initial instructor or requalification instructor evaluation. May be No-Notice. Requires ACC Form 4418 documentation.

**Squadron Supervisor**—Any of the following: SQ/CC, operations officer, assistant operations officer, commander or person specifically designated by the SQ/CC.

**Stan/Eval Board (SEB)**—A forum convened at the group level to review and resolve cybercrew related issues.

**Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE)**—A cybercrew member designated to perform evaluation duties as specified by this instruction. SEE must be qualified in the events they evaluate (**Exception:** SPOT evaluations). Unit SEEs include squadron SEE assigned to the operational cyber squadron, OGV SEE assigned to the OGV but attached to the operational cyber squadron and other Wing individuals tasked with examiner duties assigned above the squadron level. A HHQ SEE is an examiner assigned to a NAF or MAJCOM. Senior SEEs are senior cyber commanders – specifically, NAF/CCs and OG/CCs (and/or, their deputies) – that act in the capacity of SEEs.

**Stan/Eval Function**—An organization at appropriate echelons of command that accomplishes the objectives of this instruction.

**Stan/Eval Liaison Officer (SELO)**—An individual tasked to perform Stan/Eval administrative duties.

**Student Cybercrew Member**—A cybercrew member enrolled in a formal course or training under a MAJCOM approved syllabus.

**Supervised Status**—The status of a cybercrew member who must perform mission under the supervision of either an instructor or a designated supervisor (as specified in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Volume 1) qualified in that specific cybercrew position. The examiner determines when supervision is required. The type of supervisor, i.e., instructor or designated supervisor, is as specified in the applicable ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Volume 1, or as determined by the SQ/CC.

**Supplementary Evaluation**—Administrative tools used by a commander to ensure standardization of operations and to identify and evaluate implemented solutions to operational issues

**Trend Program**—Analysis designed to identify areas requiring attention, monitoring or correction.

**Unit**—A level of organization under HHQs (MAJCOM and/or NAF) required to establish a Stan/Eval function (normally this is an OG and consists of both the group and operational cyber squadrons).

**User Command**—Any Air Force MAJCOM/agency that possesses a MDS.

**Weapon System**—A combination of one or more weapons with all related equipment, materials, services, personnel, and means of delivery and deployment (if applicable) required for self-sufficiency.

**Attachment 2**  
**STAN/EVAL BOARD MINUTES**

**Table A2.1. Example Stan/Eval Minimum Board Minutes**

*Note:* The information below is an example of the minimum information a Board should address.

MEMORANDUM FOR (SEE DISTRIBUTION)

FROM: (UNIT'S COMPLETE ADDRESS)

SUBJECT: STAN/EVAL BOARD MINUTES

1. Personnel Attending: (name and organization)

2. Overview:

a. Manning. (Enter any Stan/Eval manning problems discussed or deviations from authorized manning. Record all current SEE including attached HHQ and/or attached squadron SEE.) Include any OG/CC designated additional OGV SEE.

b. Summary.

(1) Evaluations. Report EPEs and Performance evaluations by crew position and type of evaluation (QUAL and MSN as outlined in the appropriate ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 2). Include SPOT, N/N, and INIT INSTR evaluations, when applicable. Show qualification levels, sub-levels and rates (Rate = # given divided by total given).

(a) Q1s

(b) Q2s

(c) Q3s

(d) Total evaluations for each crew position

(2) Examinations. Report examination results by crew position and type of examination (open book, closed book, and CAPs).

(3) Waivers and Extensions. Identify all waivers and extensions as identified in this ACCL.

(4) Trends. Identify new, continuing and resolved trends. Where necessary, report corrective actions as OPEN/CLOSED, the OPR(s) and any suspense date.

(5) Report progress toward achievement of no-notice requirements, if applicable.

c. Stan/Eval Program Inspections and Reviews (if applicable).

d. Cybercrew Publications. Review open AF Form 847.

e. Supplementary Evaluations. Report results of evaluations conducted at both the OGV and squadron level.

3. Old Business. Enter the disposition of any items left open at the last Board meeting. If final action was taken on an item during the quarter, state the action taken and then close the item if closure is approved by the Board Chairman. If an item remains open, list the action taken since the last Board. Findings from formal Stan/Eval inspections will be addressed and covered until they are closed out.

4. New Business. Enter all new business discussed during the Board. The new business items are those included on the published agenda along with any unplanned items discussed.

5. Other: This is an optional paragraph that can be used as necessary.

6. Problems Requiring HHQ Assistance: Enter problems that, based on Board resolution, require HHQ assistance. The assistance may be in any form (for example, staff assistance visit requests, clarification of directives, change of directives, and so forth).

(SIGNATURE BLOCK)



Attachments:

1. Board Agenda
2. Stan/Eval Examiner Roster Reviewed
3. As Required

**Attachment 3  
ACC FORM 4418**

**Figure A3.1. Sample ACC Form 4418 (Front).**

CERTIFICATE OF CYBERCREW QUALIFICATION <small>** Read Privacy Act Statement on Reverse</small>				DATE COMPLETED 15 Jun 15		
<b>I. EXAMINEE IDENTIFICATION</b>						
NAME (Last, First Middle Initial) White, Roger E.		RANK Capt	DoD ID XXXXXXXXXXXX	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD Jun-Dec 16		
ORGANIZATION AND LOCATION 92 COS, JBSA-Lackland AFB, TX		WPN SYS/CREW POSITION CVA/H Crew Member				
<b>II. QUALIFICATION</b>						
<b>WRITTEN / EMERGENCY PROCEDURE PHASE</b>			<b>PERFORMANCE PHASE</b>			
<b>EXAMINATION/CHECK</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>GRADE</b>	<b>MISSION/CHECK</b>	<b>DATE</b>		
CVA/H Crew Commander	15 Jun 15	92	QUAL	15 Jun 15		
<b>QUALIFICATION LEVEL</b>		<b>ADDITIONAL TRAINING</b>				
QUALIFIED Q1	UNQUALIFIED	DUE DATE(S) N/A	DATE ADDITIONAL TRAINING COMPLETED N/A			
EXPIRATION DATE OF QUALIFICATION Dec 16	CERTIFIED INSTRUCTOR NAME, RANK AND ORGANIZATION		SIGNATURE		DATE 15 Jun 15	
<input type="checkbox"/> RESTRICTIONS <small>(Explain in Comments on Back)</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED <small>(Explain in Comments on Back)</small>		<input type="checkbox"/> COMMANDER-DIRECTED DOWNGRADE <small>(Explain in Comments on Back)</small>			
<b>III. CERTIFICATION</b>						
TYPED NAME AND GRADE	ORGANIZATION	CHECK			SIGNATURE	DATE
		C O N C U R	D O N C O U R	R E M A R K S		
1 EXAMINER John Smith, Capt	92 COS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		17 Jun 15
2 REVIEWING OFFICER David Johnson, Maj	92 COS/DO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		18 Jun 15
3 FINAL APPROVING OFFICER Tom Wright	92 OS/CC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		18 Jun 15
I CERTIFY that I have been briefed and understand the action being taken this date.						
DATE 19 Jun 15	TYPED NAME AND GRADE OF EXAMINEE Roger E. White, Capt			SIGNATURE		

Figure A3.2. Sample ACC Form 4418 (Back).

IV.	COMMENTS
RESTRICTION(S) (If Required): See para. 7.3.7.1.	
EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED (If Desired): See para. 7.3.7.2.	
EXAMINER'S REMARKS: See para. 7.3.7.3.	
A. Mission Description: See para. 7.3.7.3.2. If more than one examiner was involved in the examination, annotate here with a ___ First Event, ___ Second Event and have all but the final examiner sign a signature block (enter name, rank, and org) under each entry (see para. 7.3.7.3.1.)	
B. Discrepancies. Document all discrepancies (Q or U) or enter "None". See para. 7.3.7.3.3.	
C. Recommended Additional Training: Enter additional training or "None". See para. 7.3.7.3.4.	
D. Additional comments: Enter additional comments (to include commendable areas/sub-areas) or "None". See para. 7.3.7.3.5.	
REVIEWING OFFICER'S REMARKS: See para. 7.3.7.4.	
APPROVING OFFICER'S REMARKS: See para. 7.3.7.5.	
ADDITIONAL REVIEWERS: See para. 7.3.7.6.	
<b>PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT</b>	
<p><b>AUTHORITY:</b> This form requires the collection and or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, authorized by AFI 36-2608, Military Personnel/Records System. System of Records Notice FD11 AF AFMC B, Patriot Excalibur (PEX) System Records, applies and is available at <a href="https://dpclid.defense.gov/Privacy@ORNSIndex/DOD-Component-Notices/Air-Force-Article-List/">https://dpclid.defense.gov/Privacy@ORNSIndex/DOD-Component-Notices/Air-Force-Article-List/</a>.</p> <p><b>PURPOSE:</b> Source document used to establish and record Cybercrew training and qualification.</p> <p><b>DISCLOSURE:</b> Voluntary; however failure to provide information may result in errors in the recording of training and qualification data for Cybercrew members.</p>	

**Attachment 4**  
**CIF TEMPLATE**

**Table A4.1. Example CIF Template.**

**Note:** The information below is an example of a template MAJCOMs may use when drafting a CIF.

MEMORANDUM FOR (SEE DISTRIBUTION)

FROM: (UNIT'S COMPLETE ADDRESS)

SUBJECT: The Subject Line contains the CIF number and title of the CIF (if applicable)

1. Applicability paragraph. This paragraph lists the MAJCOM(s) that the item is applicable to, and those MAJCOMs for which the CIF item is —for information only. May also include applicable MDS or units as necessary.

2. Directive paragraph. Use this paragraph to give direction to cybercrews regarding procedures or guidance. This information should be placed immediately following the applicability paragraph in order to ensure a consistent place for new procedures or guidance.

3. Amplification paragraph. This paragraph should focus on background information to the cybercrews or any other amplifying data deemed necessary by the CIF item author for cybercrews to understand the impetus behind the CIF item. The CIF item should be limited to one or two pages in length. Additional supporting background documentation should be included in attachments or references.

a. Amplifying data may be organized into subparagraphs or follow-on paragraphs.

b. If follow-on paragraphs are used, ensure paragraphs are numbered correctly.

4. Administrative paragraph. Use this paragraph to show where the CIF item is to be placed (Part B or C), and how for long the CIF item is to remain in effect. Other items of an administrative nature may also be placed in this paragraph.

5. Receipt/POC paragraph. This paragraph directs units to acknowledge receipt of the CIF item within a desired period of time, CIF item POC(s), and the POC phone number and email address.

## Attachment 5

**EXAMINER OBJECTIVITY EVALUATION GRADING CRITERIA**

**A5.1. Instructions.** The following grading criteria will be used by CYBERCREW EXAMINERs when conducting CYBERCREW EXAMINER Objectivity Evaluations. A grade of Q- with corrective training or a U in any area will require an overall rating of "3." Cumulative deviations will be considered when determining the overall rating of either "1" or "3."

**Table A5.1. Criteria.**

GRADE	GRADE CRITERIA
<b>AREA 1--COMPLIANCE WITH STAN/EVAL DIRECTIVES</b>	
Q	Complied with all directives pertaining to the administration of a cybercrew evaluation.
Q-	Complied with most directives. Deviations did not jeopardize the effectiveness of the evaluation or safety.
U	Failed to comply with directives or allowed safety to be jeopardized.
<b>AREA 2 -- EXAMINER'S BRIEFING</b>	
Q	Thoroughly briefed the examinee on the conduct of the evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, grading criteria, and cybercrew examiner actions/position during the evaluation.
Q-	Items were omitted during the briefing causing minor confusion. Did not fully brief the examinee as to the conduct and purpose of the evaluation.
U	Cybercrew examiner failed to adequately brief the examinee.
<b>AREA 3-- IDENTIFICATION OF DISCREPANCIES AND ASSIGNMENT OF AREA GRADES</b>	
Q	Identified all discrepancies and assigned proper area grade.
Q-	Most discrepancies were identified. Failed to assign Q-grade when appropriate. Assigned discrepancies for performance which was within standards.
U	Failed to identify discrepancies related to cybercrew discipline or deviations which merited an unqualified grade. Assigned Q- grades which should have been U or assigned U grades for performance within standards.
<b>AREA 4 -- ASSESSMENT OF OVERALL PERFORMANCE</b>	
Q	Awarded the appropriate overall grade based on the examinee's performance.
Q-	Awarded an overall grade without consideration of cumulative deviations in the examinee's performance.
U	Did not award a grade commensurate with overall performance.
<b>AREA 5-- APPROPRIATE ASSIGNMENT OF ADDITIONAL TRAINING</b>	

Q	Assigned proper additional training if warranted.
Q-	Additional training assigned was insufficient to ensure the examinee would achieve proper level of qualification.
U	Failed to assign additional training when warranted.
AREA 6 -- MISSION CRITIQUE	
Q	Thoroughly debriefed the examinee on all aspects of the evaluation. Debriefed all key mission events, providing instruction and references as required.
Q-	Failed to discuss all deviations and assigned grades. Did not advise the examinee of additional training, if required. Failed to debrief or adequately reconstruct all key mission events.
U	Did not discuss any assigned area grades or the overall rating. Changed grades without briefing the examinee. Did not debrief mission at all.  Debriefed few or no key mission events.
AREA 7-- EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION	
Q	Correctly completed all required documentation.
Q-	Minor errors in documentation which did not affect the validity of the evaluation.
U	Failed to complete all required documentation. Major errors caused the validity of the evaluation to be questioned.
AREA 8 -- BRIEFING THE SUPERVISOR ON THE EVALUATION	
Q	Thoroughly debriefed the examinee's supervisor.
Q-	Debriefed the supervisor, but failed to discuss all discrepancies, grades, or additional training.
U	Failed to debrief the examinee's supervisor on an unsatisfactory evaluation.
AREA 9 -- SEE'S PERFORMANCE	
Q	SEE performed as briefed and contributed to a thorough evaluation of the examinee.
Q-	Committed minor errors which did not detract from the examinee's performance.
U	Committed major errors disrupting the examinee's performance or preventing a thorough evaluation.

Attachment 6

SAMPLE ESAP REPORT

Table A6.1. Sample ESAP Report.

# AIR COMBAT COMMAND EVALUATION STANDARDIZATION ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (ESAP) REPORT



XXX WING LOCATION
TYPE OF WEAPON SYSTEM INCLUSIVE DATES

## SECTION A

Evaluator Objectivity SPOT Evals							
Weapon System / Crew Position: XXX/XXX							
Evaluator Objectivity SPOT Evals Completed	Total Unit Evaluators	% of Total Unit Evaluators Receiving Objectivity SPOT Evals	TOTAL # and % Receiving EQ-1	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-1	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-1 w/D	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-2	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-3
#	#	%	#	#	#	#	#
			%	%	%	%	%

QUAL / MSN / INSTM / INSTR Evaluations Performed by HHQ or Observed by HHQ During Evaluator Objectivity SPOT Eval							
Weapon System / Crew Position: XXX/XXX							
Evaluations Completed (Not Including Evaluator OBJ)	Total Aircrew	% of Aircrew Receiving Evaluations	TOTAL # and % Receiving EQ-1	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-1	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-1 w/D	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-2	TOTAL # and % Receiving Q-3
#	#	%	#	#	#	#	#
			%	%	%	%	%

EVALUATION STANDARDIZATION ASSESSMENT VISIT BREAKDOWN	
% QUAL	% MSN
%	%

QUALIFICATION OF EXAMINEES	
% Instructor	% Mission Aircrew
%	%

EVALUATION (FLIGHT) vs. REQUISITE (EPE)	
% Flight	% EPE
%	%



Aircraft	Crew Position	Type of Evaluation	Evaluation (Flight) or Requisite (EPE)	HHQ FE or Observed	Qualification Level						Remarks		
					EQ	Q-1	Q-1 w/D	Q-2	Q-3	Incomp	Downgrade / Commendable	Area #	Area Description

## SECTION B

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

- **GENERAL:**
- **OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS:**
- **OTHER OBSERVATIONS/SUPERIOR PERFORMERS:**

## SECTION C

**GENERAL:**

1. List of HHQ Evaluators:
  - a. XXX X. XXX / Rank / MDS / Crew Position / HHQ Office (Team Lead)
  - b. XXX X. XXX / Rank / MDS / Crew Position / HHQ Office

**X**

---

XXX X. XXX, Rank, USAF  
Chief of Standardization and Evaluation

**DISTRIBUTION:**

- ACC/A3
- ACC/A3T
- ACC/A3TV
- ACC/IGI
- NAF/A3
- NAF/A3V
- WG/CC
- OG/CC
- OG/OGV
- SQ/CC

## Attachment 7

### BRIEFING FACILITIES GUIDANCE

**A7.1. Scope.** As a minimum, the following mission planning/briefing materials will be available in the briefing rooms and mission planning areas. **(T-2).** Applicable items should provide readily accessible instructional value. Units may add/delete items appropriate for unit MDS.

A7.1.1. Network diagram.

A7.1.2. Dry Erase Board (or equivalent).

A7.1.3. Publications:

A7.1.3.1. Checklist, and crew aid.

A7.1.3.2. ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 3 and local directives.

A7.1.3.3. Crew Information File (CIF)

A7.1.3.4. Cyber Tasking Order (CTO)

A7.1.3.5. Special Instructions (SPINs)

A7.1.3.6. AFTTP 3-1 / Joint Cyber Tactics Manual (JCTM)

A7.1.3.7. Technical Orders (TO)

A7.1.4. Mission Planning Computer

A7.1.5. VTC / Voice Communication

A7.1.6. current posting of all current and applicable Special Interest Items.

#### **A7.2. Notes:**

A7.2.1. Any of the above information may be maintained electronically if easily accessible to briefer.

A7.2.2. Squadrons may maintain manuals, ACCMAN17-2(MDS) Vol 3 and local directives, and Information Publications in close proximity to briefing rooms.

A7.2.3. Units will maintain an effective backup capability (e.g. backup laptop computer, printouts of slides, and/or maps in a binder) in the event technical difficulties prevent cybercrew from using electronic versions. **(T-2).**

A7.2.4. Briefing rooms should be well lighted and of adequate size to comfortably seat all cybercrew members.