

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

**AIR COMBAT COMMAND MANUAL
17-2AFINC, Volume 2**

18 MARCH 2021

Cyberspace

**AIR FORCE INTRANET CONTROL
(AFINC) - 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.

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: USAF/ACC/A600

Certified by: ACC/A3T
(Mr. John F. Costa)

Supersedes: ACCMAN17-2AFINCV2,
4 January 2021

Pages: 30

This publication implements Air Combat Command Instruction (ACCI) 17-202 Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization/Evaluation Program*. It provides guidance and procedures for Air Force Intranet Control (AFINC) Standardization/Evaluation programs. This publication applies to all Air Combat Command (ACC)-assigned and attached military and civilian Air Force (AF) personnel, members of the AF Reserve Command (AFRC), Air National Guard (ANG), and contractor support personnel in accordance with (IAW) appropriate provisions contained in memoranda support agreements and AF contracts. This publication requires the collection and or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, authorized by Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*. Ensure that all records and processes prescribed in this publication are maintained IAW AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and are disposed IAW the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule, located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. 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/>. 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. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*; route AF Forms 847 from the field through the appropriate functional chain of command. The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier (“T-0, T-2, T-3”) number

following the compliance statement. See Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority, or alternately, to the requester’s commander for non-tiered compliance items.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Prescribed forms updated to “none”, no content changes have been made.

Chapter 1— GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1. General.	4
1.2. Objectives.	4
1.3. Roles & Responsibilities.....	4
1.4. Standardization and Evaluation Examiners (SEE) Requirements.	4
1.5. General Evaluation Requirements:	6
Table 1.1. Crew Position Specific Requirements - Written Examinations.	7
1.6. Grading Instructions.	8
Table 1.2. Crew Position Specific Requirements - Performance Phase Evaluations.....	9
Chapter 2— CREW POSITION EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	10
2.1. General.	10
2.2. Qualification Evaluations:	10
2.3. Mission Certifications.	10
2.4. General Crew Position Evaluation Standards.	10
Chapter 3— INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	18
3.1. General.	18
3.2. Instructor Upgrade and Qualification Requisites.	18
3.3. INSTR Qualification Evaluations:	18
3.4. Instructor Evaluation Criteria.	18
3.5. INSTR Evaluation Documentation.	20
Chapter 4— SEE OBJECTIVITY EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	22
4.1. General.	22
4.2. Evaluator Upgrade and Qualification Requisites.	22

4.3.	SEE Objectivity Evaluations.	22
4.4.	SEE Objectivity Evaluation Grading Criteria.	23
4.5.	SEE Objectivity Evaluation Documentation.	25
Attachment 1— GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION		26

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. General. This manual provides cyberspace operations examiners and cybercrew members with procedures and evaluation criteria used during performance evaluations on the AFINC weapon system. For evaluation purposes, refer to this Air Combat Command Manual (ACCMAN) for evaluation standards. Adherence to these procedures and criteria will ensure an accurate assessment of the proficiency and capabilities of cyber crewmembers. In addition to general criteria information and grading criteria, this ACCMAN provides specific information and grading criteria for each crew position, instructor upgrade qualification, and Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Examiner (SEE) objectivity evaluations.

1.2. Objectives.

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

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

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

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

1.2.5. To recognize trends in order to recommend/initiate changes to training programs and directives within AFINC weapon system.

1.3. Roles & Responsibilities.

1.3.1. Refer to ACCI 17-202V2 for all Major Command (MAJCOM) and Number Air Force (NAF) Stan/Eval roles, responsibilities and programs. For the purposes of this manual, "MAJCOM" includes direct reporting units, AFRC, and the National Guard Bureau (NGB).

1.3.2. Refer to ACCI 17-202V2 for all unit-level Stan/Eval roles, responsibilities and programs. For purposes of this manual, "unit" includes levels of organization under Higher Headquarters (HHQ) required to establish a Stan/Eval function.

1.4. Standardization and Evaluation Examiners (SEE) Requirements. SEEs will use the grading policies contained in ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization/Evaluation Program*, and the evaluation criteria in this manual for conducting all Air Combat Command (ACC) and ACC-oversight units' weapon system performance, Cybercrew Training Device (CTD), and Emergency Procedures Evaluations (EPE). All evaluations assume a stable platform and normal operating conditions. Compound emergency procedures (e.g., a scenario involving multiple emergency procedures) will not be used. **(T-2).**

1.4.1. Each squadron will design and maintain evaluation profiles that are realistic, reflect unit tasking, be consistent with daily training missions, and incorporate current tactics applicable to the unit's mission and each crew position for the AFINC weapon system. These profiles, approved by the Cyber Operations Group (COG) Standardization/Evaluation (COG/OGV), will outline the minimum number and type of events to be performed/observed to satisfy a

complete evaluation. Evaluation profiles will incorporate requirements established in the applicable grading criteria and reflect the primary unit tasking. **(T-3).**

1.4.2. All evaluations fall under the Qualification (QUAL), Mission (MSN), Spot (SPOT), or Instructor (INSTR) categories in ACCI 17-202, Volume 2. For dual/multiple qualification or difference evaluations (an evaluation that covers major changes in an existing capability) that do not update an eligibility period, list as "SPOT" on the front of the ACC Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification*, and explain that it was a difference evaluation under "Mission Description." **(T-2).**

1.4.2.1. Schedule all evaluation activity on one mission/sortie to the greatest extent possible. All performance phase requirements should be accomplished during a training (or operational if training not available) mission/sortie. If a required event is not accomplished during a mission/sortie, COG/CC is the waiver authority for the event to be completed in the CTD. This may be delegated no lower than the Squadron Commander (SQ/CC) unless otherwise authorized in position-specific chapters of this manual. **(T-3)**

1.4.2.2. During all evaluations, any grading areas observed by the SEE may be evaluated. If additional training is required for areas outside of the scheduled evaluation, document the training required under Block IV of ACC Form 4418. **(T-2).**

1.4.2.3. This manual contains a table of requirements for the written requisites and a table for the grading criteria for various evaluations. Each table may include a "Note" which refers to a general note found in the individual grading criteria, and/or a number which refers to a note shown below the table. To complete an evaluation, all areas annotated with an "R" must be successfully completed. **(T-2).**

1.4.2.4. Unit SEE's may administer evaluations outside of their organization to include administering evaluations between ACC, AFRC and ANG provided written agreements/understandings between the affected organizations are in-place. Written agreements/understandings shall be reviewed and updated annually. **(T-3).**

1.4.3. 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 or the mission. 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. **(T-2).**

1.4.4. SEEs will not evaluate examinees with whom they have instructed more than 50% of the qualification/upgrade training performance events without SQ/CC approval. SEEs will not evaluate students they recommended for end of training qualification/upgrade evaluation unless approved by the SQ/CC. **(T-3).**

1.4.5. All crewmembers for the mission/sortie (to include students, instructors, examinees, and SEE's) will participate in and adhere to all required mission planning, mission briefing, mission execution, and mission debriefing requirements. All crewmembers must be current on the Crewmember Information File (CIF) and meet all Go/No-Go requirements IAW ACCI 17-202 series publications, this publication, and all applicable supplemental guidance prior to operating, instructing, or evaluating on the weapon system. **(T-2).**

1.5. General Evaluation Requirements:

1.5.1. Publications Check. Unless using publications from their direct source, a publication check will be accomplished IAW applicable publication guidance (e.g., AFIs, Technical Orders). -The publications check will be annotated in the Comments block of the ACC Form 4418 during initial issue of items to student crewmembers, after inspections of crewmember's issued items when called to do so by cadre, and during turn-in of issued items at the end of training. The List of Effective Pages (LEP) and annual "A" page checks in individually issued operating manuals must be accomplished, documented, and current. Unit Stan/Eval will list the required operating publications each cybercrew member is responsible for in the local CIF Library and/or local supplement to ACCI 17-202, Volume 2. **Note:** In units where such resources are not individually issued but made available/accessible for common use, the squadron Stan/Eval office will list those items (version and date) and ensure the accuracy and currency of the information contained in those resources for common use.

1.5.2. Written Examinations. The requisites in **Table 1.1** are common to all AFINC crew positions and will be accomplished IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, all applicable supplemental guidance, and unit directives. These will be accomplished prior to the mission/sortie performance phase unless in conjunction with a No-Notice (N/N) QUAL. **(T-2). Note:** A N/N evaluation conducted in the examinee's eligibility period, but only after an initial evaluation (INIT) has occurred, and meeting all required QUAL profile requirements affords the examinee to opt for the N/N evaluation to satisfy a periodic QUAL, in which the examinee may complete written and EPE requisites after the performance phase. However, the written examination(s) and EPE must be completed prior to the examinee's qualification expiration date.

1.5.3. EPE. Every QUAL evaluation which updates an expiration date will include an EPE. QUAL EPEs will evaluate the crewmember's knowledge and/or performance of emergency procedures, to include use of emergency equipment. Use the Emergency Procedures/Equipment grading criteria for all emergency situations given. Use Systems Knowledge/Operations grading criteria to evaluate general systems operation. An EPE will be accomplished orally and may be conducted before, during, or after the performance phase of any applicable evaluation conducting a scenario-based evaluation using question and answer (Q&A) techniques. Units will determine scenarios for EPEs. The SEE will assign an overall EPE grade (1 or 3). The evaluation criteria for EPEs is defined in Area 8. Document the accomplishment and result of the EPE in the WRITTEN/EMERGENCY PROCEDURE PHASE block of Section II Qualification on the ACC Form 4418. **(T-2).**

Table 1.1. Crew Position Specific Requirements - Written Examinations.

Examination Type	CC Quals	OC Quals	Boundary	DNS/ MEG	Router
CLOSED BOOK (Note 1)	R	R	R	R	R
EPE (Note 2)	R	R	R	R	R
OPEN BOOK (Note 3)	O	O	O	O	O
CC-Cyber Crew OC-Operations Controller R-Required, O -Optional Notes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CLOSED BOOK exam consists of 25-50 questions derived from applicable operations manuals and governing directives. (T-2). 2. The Emergency Procedure Examination (EPE) is required for all INIT QUAL and subsequent periodic QUAL evaluations covering duties in the member's primary crew position. (T-2). 3. Units may opt to administer OPEN BOOK examinations to their crews to evaluate operator knowledge. 					

1.5.4. Qualification Evaluations (QUALS). These evaluations measure a crewmember's ability to meet grading areas listed in **Table 1.2** at the end of this chapter and defined in **Chapter 2** of this manual. IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2 and weapon system-specific guidance, QUALS may be combined with MSN evaluations. When practical, QUALS should be combined with INSTR evaluations, as applicable for the crew position. **(T-2)**.

1.5.5. MSN Evaluations. IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2 and this manual, the requirement for a separate MSN evaluation may be combined with the QUAL evaluation. The various procedures and techniques used throughout the different weapon system variants are managed through a training program which results in a mission qualification. Mission certifications will be IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*, ACCMAN 17-2AFINC, Volume 1, *Air Force Intranet Control (AFINC) Cybercrew Training* and all applicable supplements and will be documented in the appropriate training folder. MSN evaluation grading areas are also listed in **Table 1.2** at the end of this chapter and defined in **Chapter 2** of this manual. **(T-2)**.

1.5.5.1. For cybercrew members who maintain multiple mission certifications, recurring evaluations need only evaluate the primary assigned mission certification as long as currency is maintained in all other required matching/similar training events in the other certifications. **(T-2)**.

1.5.6. INSTR Evaluations. Grading areas for these evaluations are listed in **Table 1.2** at the end of this chapter. See **Chapter 3** of this manual for amplified information and grading area definitions. **(T-2)**.

1.5.7. SEE Objectivity Evaluations. Grading areas for these evaluations are listed in **Table 1.2** at the end of this chapter. See **Chapter 4** of this publication for amplified information and grading area definitions. **(T-2)**.

1.5.8. N/N Evaluations. COG/CC will determine N/N evaluation procedures/goals. **(T-3)**.

1.6. Grading Instructions. Q, Q- and U ratings are used for specific evaluation areas. Q1, Q2, and Q3 are used for the overall evaluation rating. While the three-level grading system (Q, Q-, U) is used for most areas; a "Q-" grade will not be used for critical evaluation areas.

1.6.1. Critical Area/Subarea. Critical areas require the examinee to successfully accomplish events to safely and adequately achieve the mission/sortie objectives. These events, if not adequately accomplished, could result in mission failure, endanger human life, or cause serious injury or death. Additionally, critical areas/subareas apply to time-sensitive tasks or tasks that must be accomplished as expeditiously as possible without any intervening lower priority actions that would, in the normal sequence of events, adversely affect task performance/outcome. If an examinee receives a "U" grade in any critical area, the overall grade for the evaluation will be "Q-3." Critical areas are identified by "(C)" following the applicable area title. **(T-2).**

1.6.2. Major Area/Subarea. Major areas are events or tasks deemed integral to the performance of other tasks and required to sustain acceptable weapon system operations and mission execution. If an examinee receives a "U" grade in a non-critical area then the overall grade awarded will be no higher than "Q-2." An examinee receiving a "Q-" grade in a non-critical area or areas may still receive a "Q-1" overall grade at evaluator discretion. An overall "Q-3" can be awarded if, in the judgment of the SEE, there is justification based on performance in one or several areas/sub areas. Major areas are identified by "(M)" following the applicable area title. **(T-2).**

1.6.3. The SEE must exercise judgment when the wording of areas is subjective and when specific situations are not covered.

1.6.4. Evaluator judgment will be the final determining factor in deciding the overall qualification level. **(T-2).**

Table 1.2. Crew Position Specific Requirements - Performance Phase Evaluations.

AREA/TITLE	Category	Crew Position					Upgrade	
	C, M	CC	OC	DNS/ MEG	RTR	BP	INSTR	SEE
1. Mission Planning	M	R	R	R	R	R		
2. Systems / Equipment Knowledge	M	R	R	R	R	R		
3. Briefing	M	R	R	R	R	R		
4. Positional Changeover Brief	M	R	R	R	R	R		
5. Pre-Sortie Check Procedures	M	R	R	R	R	R		
6. Situational Awareness	C	R	R	R	R	R		
7. Safety	C	R	R	R	R	R		
8. Emergency Equipment / Procedures	M	R	R	R	R	R		
9. Crew Discipline	C	R	R	R	R	R		
10. Crew Coordination	M	R	R	R	R	R		
11. Communication	M	R	R	R	R	R		
12. Task Management	M	R	R	R	R	R		
13. Reports, Logs and Forms	M	R	R	R	R	R		
14. Crew Debrief	M	R	R	R	R	R		
15. Composite Force/Mutual Support	M	R	R	R	R	R		
16. Cyberspace Collection	M			R	R	R		
17. Cyberspace Strike	M			R		R		
18. Cyberspace Control	M			R	R	R		
Instructor Grading Criteria								
19. Instructional Ability	M						R	
20. Instructional Briefings/Critique	M						R	
21. Demonstration and Performance	M						R	
Stan/Eval Examiner Objectivity Evaluation Criteria								
22. Compliance with Directives	M							R
23. SEE Briefing	M							R
24. Performance Assessment /Grading	M							R
25. Additional Training Assignment	M							R
26. Examinee Debrief	M							R
27. Supervisor Debrief	M							R
28. SEE Performance/Documentation	M							R
C – critical; M – major; R – required, CC – Crew Commander OC – Operations Controller								

Chapter 2

CREW POSITION EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

2.1. General. The grading criteria contained in this chapter are applicable to evaluations for all AFINC crew positions, establishing by experience, policies, and procedures set forth in weapon system manuals and other directives. Evaluators must realize that grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Written parameters, tempered with mission objectives and, more importantly, mission/task accomplishment in the determination of overall crew performance. Requirements for each evaluation are as follows:

2.2. Qualification Evaluations:

2.2.1. Written Examination Requisites: See **Table 1.1. (T-2)**.

2.2.2. Emergency Procedures Evaluations: Follow **Chapter 1, Paragraph 1.4, and its subparas. (T-2)**.

2.2.3. Performance Phase: Required Areas 1 through 18 in **Table 1.2** will be evaluated, unless not applicable as noted. **(T-2)**.

2.3. Mission Certifications. Mission Certifications ensures individuals are capable of performing duties essential to the effective employment of the weapon system. Mission Certifications are accomplished IAW local training requirements and/or SQ/CC directions. Mission certification events are normally performed during QUAL evaluations but may be performed on any mission/sortie with an instructor certified in that mission. **(T-2)**.

2.4. General Crew Position Evaluation Standards. The following general evaluation grading standards are common to all crew positions, unless indicated, and additional certifications will be created and used for all applicable evaluations:

2.4.1. AREA 1, Mission Planning (M).

2.4.1.1. Q. Led or contributed to mission planning efforts IAW procedures prescribed in applicable guidance manuals, instructions, and/or directives.

2.4.1.1.1. Planning adequately addressed mission objectives and/or tasking.

2.4.1.1.2. Plan adequately considered intelligence information, weapon system capability/operating status, and crew composition/ability with minor errors/deviations/omissions that did not impact mission effectiveness.

2.4.1.1.3. Verified review of all CIF Vol 1, Part B items and complied with Go/No-Go procedures prior to mission start.

2.4.1.1.4. Was prepared at briefing time.

2.4.1.2. Q-. Errors/deviations/omissions had minor impact on mission effectiveness or efficiencies, but did not impact mission accomplishment or jeopardize mission success.

2.4.1.3. U. Failed to:

2.4.1.3.1. Support the mission planning effort,

2.4.1.3.2. Conduct a review CIF and/or comply with Go/No-Go procedures,

2.4.1.3.3. Comply with procedures prescribed in applicable guidance manuals, instructions, and/or directives which contributed to significant deficiencies in mission execution or accomplishment.

2.4.1.3.4. Lead and/or participate in all required briefings and/or planning meetings without appropriate approval.

2.4.2. AREA 2, Systems and Equipment Knowledge (M).

2.4.2.1. Q. Demonstrated thorough knowledge of network traffic flow, architecture, system component(s)/equipment, limitations, performance characteristics and operating procedures. Correctly identified and located applicable components/equipment and determined operational status of system. Properly configured system components/equipment. Correctly identified and applied proper action(s) for system/equipment malfunctions. Followed all applicable system/equipment operating directives, guides, manuals etc.

2.4.2.2. Q-. Minor deficiencies in demonstrating knowledge of network traffic flow, architecture, system component(s)/equipment, limitations, performance characteristics, or operating procedures but sufficient to perform the mission safely. Able to identify and locate components/equipment with minor errors. Slow to identify malfunctions and/or apply corrective actions with minor errors, omissions, or deviations. Followed all system/equipment operating directives, guides, manuals...etc. with minor errors, omissions, or deviations. Did not damage system/components/equipment or jeopardize mission success.

2.4.2.3. U. Did not demonstrate minimum fundamental knowledge of network traffic flow, architecture system component(s)/equipment, limitations, performance characteristics or operating procedures. Unable to identify or failed to locate essential components/equipment. Failed to identify malfunctions and/or apply corrective actions. Failed to follow system/equipment operating directives, guides, manuals, etc., resulting in unsatisfactory employment and/or causing potential jeopardy of mission failure. Poor procedures resulted in damage to system components/equipment and/or jeopardy of mission failure.

2.4.3. AREA 3, Briefing (M).

2.4.3.1. Q. Led or contributed to briefing effort as appropriate. Utilized/followed local briefing guides, manuals and/or instructions. The briefing was well organized and presented in a logical sequence, appropriate length, and professional manner. Effectively incorporated briefing/training aids where applicable and effective techniques required for accomplishing the mission. Briefed mission tasking/priorities, crew responsibilities/coordination, weapon system employment/sensor management, de-confliction contracts, and mission package integration (as applicable). Accurately briefed the current situational awareness status. Crewmembers clearly understood roles, responsibilities, and mission requirements. Was prepared at briefing time.

2.4.3.2. Q-. Led or contributed to briefing effort with minor errors/omissions/deviations. Utilized/followed local briefing guides, manuals and/or instructions with minor deviations. Briefing anomalies had minor impact on mission effectiveness but did not jeopardize mission success.

2.4.3.3. U. Inadequate leadership or participation in briefing development and/or presentation. Did not utilize/follow local briefing guides, manuals and/or instructions. Disorganized and/or confusing presentation. Ineffective use of briefing/training aids. Failed to brief mission tasking/priorities, crew responsibilities/coordination, weapon system employment/sensor management, de-confliction contracts, and mission package integration (as applicable). Failed to present major training events. Failed to present an accurate situational awareness picture; not prepared at briefing time.

2.4.4. AREA 4, Positional Changeover Brief (M).

2.4.4.1. Q. Outgoing crewmember prepared and conducted a comprehensive positional changeover briefing with the oncoming crewmember IAW crew aids and/or applicable directives. Reviewed factors, conditions, and the current operational/tactical situation for all Defensive Cyberspace Operations missions, packages, sorties, etc. with the oncoming crew member and ensured items necessary for the effective conduct of tasked missions were understood by the oncoming crewmember. Minor errors, omissions, and or /deviations did not impact mission effectiveness. Verified review of all CIF Vol 1, Part B items and complied with Go/No-Go procedures prior to mission start. Oncoming crewmember or SEE asked questions as applicable to ensure mission effectiveness/accomplishment of outgoing crewmember. Oncoming crewmember participation is not evaluated.

2.4.4.2. Q-. Outgoing crewmember prepared and conducted a positional changeover briefing with minor errors, omissions, and/or deviations using crew aids and applicable directives. Changeover briefing anomalies had minor impact on mission effectiveness but did not jeopardize mission success. Oncoming crew member's level of attentiveness during changeover led to minor mission impact but did not jeopardize overall mission success.

2.4.4.3. U. Outgoing crewmember failed to prepare and conduct an effective positional changeover briefing with the oncoming crewmember and/or failed to use appropriate crew aids and applicable directives. Changeover briefing contained errors, omissions, and/or deviations that could have significantly detracted from mission effectiveness and/or jeopardized mission success. Failed to review CIF and/or comply with Go/No-Go procedures. Oncoming crew member's lack of attentiveness significantly detracted from mission effectiveness and/or jeopardized mission success.

2.4.5. AREA 5, Pre-Mission/Sortie Check Procedures (M).

2.4.5.1. Q. Performed all mission/operations checks as required IAW applicable guides and/or crew aids. Adequately ensured, determined, and/or verified weapon system operational state and cybercrew readiness prior to on-watch period or entering tasked vulnerability period. Ensured crew understanding of most up-to-date tasking(s) prior to on-watch or vulnerability period execution. Deviated from crew aids and/or omitted steps only when appropriate and was able to substantiate justification. Minor errors/deviations/omissions did not detract from mission efficiencies nor jeopardize mission success.

2.4.5.2. Q-. Minor errors and/or omissions occurred without justification but did not jeopardize overall mission success.

2.4.5.3. U. Did not perform mission/operations checks. Failed to determine/verify weapon system operational state and cybercrew readiness prior to on-watch period or entering tasked vulnerability period. Did not utilize any crew aids and/or utilized wrong crew aids. Errors/deviations/omissions contributed to jeopardizing mission success.

2.4.6. AREA 6, Situational Awareness (C).

2.4.6.1. Q. Conducted the mission with a sense of understanding/comprehension and in a timely, efficient manner. Anticipated situations which would have adversely affected the mission and made appropriate decisions based on available information. Maintained overall good situational awareness. Recognized temporary loss of situational awareness in self or others and took appropriate action to regain awareness without detracting from mission accomplishment or jeopardizing safety.

2.4.6.2. U. Decisions or lack thereof resulted jeopardizing the assigned mission. Demonstrated poor judgment or loss of situational awareness.

2.4.7. AREA 7, Safety (C).

2.4.7.1. Q. Aware of and complied with all factors required for safe operations and mission accomplishment.

2.4.7.2. U. Unaware of safety factors or disregarded procedures to safely operate the weapon system and/or conduct the mission. Conducted unsafe actions that jeopardized mission accomplishment and/or put crewmembers at risk of injury or death. Operated in a manner that could or did result in damage to the weapon system/equipment.

2.4.8. AREA 8, Emergency Procedures and Equipment (M).

2.4.8.1. Q. Demonstrated/explained thorough knowledge of location and proper use of emergency equipment. Demonstrated/explained effective coordination of emergency actions with other crewmembers without delay or confusion. Followed appropriate crew aids as required. Minor errors did not impact efficiencies in addressing the emergency. (This area may be evaluated orally.)

2.4.8.2. Q-. Recognized emergency situations or malfunctions but slow to demonstrate/explain appropriate response actions. Examinee demonstrated/explained correct procedures with minor errors and/or was slow to locate equipment and/or appropriate crew aids. Slow or hesitant to demonstrate/explain effective coordination of emergency actions with other crewmembers. Minor crew aids errors, omissions, and/or deviations caused minor inefficiencies addressing the emergency situation/malfunction but did not exacerbate the situation.

2.4.8.3. U. Failed to recognize emergency situations or malfunctions. Failed to demonstrate/explain proper response actions. Failed to demonstrate/explain knowledge of location or proper use of emergency equipment or crew aids. Failed to demonstrate/explain coordination of emergency actions with other crewmembers. Crew aids errors, omissions, and/or deviations contributed to ineffective actions or exacerbating an emergency situation and/or malfunction.

2.4.9. AREA 9, Crew Discipline (C).

2.4.9.1. Q. Demonstrated strict professional crew discipline throughout all phases of the mission. Planned, briefed, executed, and debriefed mission in accordance with applicable instructions and directives.

2.4.9.2. U. Failed to demonstrate strict professional crew discipline throughout all phases of the mission. Violated or failed to comply with applicable instructions and directives which could have jeopardized safety of crewmembers or mission accomplishment.

2.4.10. AREA 10, Crew Coordination (M).

2.4.10.1. Q. Effectively coordinated with other crewmembers and/or teams during all phases of the mission enabling efficient, well-coordinated actions. Demonstrated knowledge of other crewmembers' duties and responsibilities. Proactively provided direction and/or information to the crew; communicated in a clear and effective manner, actively sought other crewmember opinions and/or ideas, and asked for or provided constructive feedback as necessary.

2.4.10.2. Q-. Some breakdowns in communication but did not detract from overall mission success. Demonstrated limited knowledge of other crewmembers' and/or teams' duties/responsibilities. Unclear communication at times caused confusion and/or limited crew/team interaction. Some unnecessary prompting required from other crewmembers.

2.4.10.3. U. Failed to coordinate with other crewmembers or teams during all phases of the mission. Did not demonstrate knowledge of other crewmembers or teams. Communication consistently confuses or causes failures or missteps amongst the crew.

2.4.11. AREA 11, Communication (M).

2.4.11.1. Q. Timely and effective communication with external agencies and/or mission partners when required. Concise and accurate information passed using proper medium, terminology, format and/or brevity IAW applicable crew aids. Sound understanding and use of voice, email, chat, and collaborative tools to communicate mission essential information. Demonstrated a thorough understanding of Operations Security (OPSEC) procedures.

2.4.11.2. Q-. Minor errors/deviations/omissions in communications with external agencies and/or mission partners that did not detract from overall mission accomplishment. Limited understanding and use of voice, email, chat, and collaborative tools. Demonstrated limited understanding of OPSEC procedures with minor errors or deviations that did not jeopardize mission accomplishment. Deviated from applicable crew aids but did not jeopardize mission success.

2.4.11.3. U. Severe breakdowns in communication with external agencies and/or mission partners precluded mission effectiveness/failure or jeopardized safety of others. Unclear/inaccurate information passed or improper/inadequate use of medium, terminology, format, and/or brevity put mission accomplishment at risk. Significant OPSEC errors or deviations jeopardized mission accomplishment. Did not use crew aids.

2.4.12. AREA 12, Task Management (M).

2.4.12.1. Q. Accurately identified, effectively prioritized, and/or efficiently managed the tasks based on all information. Used available resources to manage workload, communicated task priorities to other crew members and/or internal teams. Recognized

and requested assistance from other crewmembers when task-saturated. Gathered and crosschecked available data and effectively identified alternatives when necessary. Clearly stated decisions and ensured they were understood. Investigated doubts and concerns of other crew members when necessary.

2.4.12.2. Q-. Identified, prioritized, and managed tasks with minor omissions and/or errors which did not affect safety of crewmembers or effective mission accomplishment. Limited use of available resources to manage workload and/or did not completely communicate task priorities to other crew members and/or internal teams. Slow to recognize task saturation and/or request assistance from crewmembers. Made minor errors in identifying contingencies, gathering data, or communicating a decision but did not affect safe or effective mission accomplishment.

2.4.12.3. U. Failed to identify, prioritize, or manage essential tasks leading to possible unsafe conditions or significant risk to mission accomplishment. Failed to communicate task priorities to other crew members and/or internal teams. Improperly or unable to identify contingencies, gather data, or communicate decisions putting mission accomplishment and/or safety of others at risk. Failed to recognize task overload or failed to seek assistance from other crewmembers which put at risk mission accomplishment or safety of crewmembers.

2.4.13. AREA 13, Reports, Logs and Forms (M).

2.4.13.1. Q. Recognized all situations meeting reporting criteria. When required, provided timely, accurate, and correctly formatted reports [e.g., Tactical Reports (TACREP), Situation Reports (SITREP), Mission Reports (MISREP)], or inputs to mission-related information management portals/collaborative information sharing environments. All required logs (e.g., Master Station Log), media and forms were complete, accurate, legible, and accomplished on time and IAW with applicable directives, tasking, and policy. Information was provided in sufficient detail to allow accurate and timely analysis of associated data. Complied with security procedures and directives.

2.4.13.2. Q-. Minor errors, deviations, omissions, and/or latency on required reports, logs, media, or forms led to minor inefficiencies but did not affect conduct of the mission. Complied with security procedures and directives.

2.4.13.3. U. Failed to recognize situations meeting reporting criteria and/or failed to report events essential to mission accomplishment. Major errors, deviations, omissions, and/or latency in accomplishing logs, reports/inputs, media, or forms precluded effective mission accomplishment or analysis of mission data. Failed to comply with security procedures and directives.

2.4.14. AREA 14, Crew Debrief (M).

2.4.14.1. Q. Debriefed the mission thoroughly or contributed to the briefing content to ensure it included all pertinent items. Reconstructed operational events, compared results with initial objectives for the mission, debriefed deviations, and provided individual crew member feedback as appropriate. Organized IAW guidance/directives and professionally presented in a logical sequence using available briefing aids. Summarized lessons learned and ensured they were documented. Provided AFINC/CC or AFINC/OC with applicable input on all required mission/crew/system-related events, including mission log, report,

and/or database information for inclusion in the crew debrief. Used applicable crew aid(s) as required.

2.4.14.2. Q-. Led or contributed to debriefing effort with minor errors, omissions, and/or deviations. Some events out of sequence with some unnecessary redundancy.

2.4.14.3. U. Inadequate leadership or participation in debrief. Disorganized and/or confusing debriefing presentation. Ineffective use of briefing/training aids. Failed to reconstruct operational events, compare results with initial objectives for the mission, debrief deviations, and/or offer corrective guidance as appropriate. Absent from debrief (whole or in-part) without appropriate supervisor approval.

2.4.15. AREA 15, Composite Force (CF) / Mutual Support (MS) (M).

2.4.15.1. Q. Effectively planned and leveraged CF support, MS agencies, and/or internal/external teams when needed.

2.4.15.2. Q-. Limited planning and/or leverage of CF support or MS agency support contributed to confusion among all or some agencies/teams. Less than optimum mission efficiency, however overall mission success was not jeopardized.

2.4.15.3. U. Inadequate or incorrect planning/leverage of CF support, MS agency support, and/or internal/external team support, resulted in jeopardizing mission success, or caused mission failure. Did not leverage support when needed.

2.4.16. AREA 16, Cyberspace Collection (M).

2.4.16.1. Q. Effective and timely execution resulted in prompt collection of relevant data and information from targeted terrain IAW tasking.

2.4.16.2. Q-. Minor errors caused less than optimal data and information collection from the targeted terrain resulting in minor data loss.

2.4.16.3. U. Major errors delayed or prevented data and information collection and/or resulted in data and information collection failure. Collected information was not related to targeted terrain and/or tasking.

2.4.17. AREA 17, Cyberspace Effects (M).

2.4.17.1. Q. Effectively degraded, disrupted, denied, or destroyed adversary activity in a timely and effective manner IAW all Rules of Engagement (ROEs) and given restrictions.

2.4.17.2. Q-. Minor errors in execution led to slower than desired performance in degrading, disrupting, denying or destroying adversary activity. Required ample assistance from other crew members to complete the mission but did not affect overall mission success.

2.4.17.3. U. Failed to degrade, disrupt, deny, or destroy adversary activity in a timely and effective manner. IAW all ROEs and given restrictions. Errors in execution caused a major delay in the mission execution window or prevented mission accomplishment.

2.4.18. AREA 18, Cyberspace Control (M).

2.4.18.1. Q. Effective coordination with outside agency(s) and timely execution resulted in prompt access and/or network freedom of maneuver for supported cyberspace forces IAW tasking, ROEs and restrictions without errors.

2.4.18.2. Q-. Remained IAW tasking but minor errors and/or less than optimal coordination with cyberspace partner(s) caused access and/or freedom of maneuver delays for supported cyberspace forces but did not cause mission failure.

2.4.18.3. U. Major errors delayed or prevented execution, access or network freedom of maneuver. Employment/engagement was outside the tasking and/or caused mission failure.

Chapter 3

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

3.1. General. Grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Evaluator judgement should consider sortie objectives and task accomplishment in the determination of overall aircrew performance.

3.2. Instructor Upgrade and Qualification Requisites. Prior to an INIT INSTR Evaluation, Instructor examinees must complete all requisites for Instructor upgrade consideration, nomination, and training IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, ACCMAN 17-2AFINCV1, and all applicable supplemental guidance.

3.3. INSTR Qualification Evaluations: When possible, units should strive to combine INSTR evaluations (INIT and recurring/periodic) with periodic QUAL evaluations. INSTR evaluations can only be combined with QUAL evaluations when the examinee is in their periodic QUAL eligibility period. There is no eligibility period associated with an Instructor Qualification, however, Instructor qualifications will expire after the 17th month from the previous Instructor Qualification Evaluation or when any of that instructor's primary qualifications for being an instructor expire (e.g., weapon system specific to instructorship) or when receiving a "U" during a periodic INSTR eval. See [paragraph 3.5](#) for documentation guidance.

3.3.1. INIT INSTR evaluations should be conducted with a student occupying the applicable cybercrew position whenever possible. Recurring or periodic INSTR Evaluations may be conducted with the SEE role-playing as the student.

3.3.2. The instructor examinee will monitor all phases of the mission from an advantageous position and be prepared to demonstrate or explain any area or procedure. The SEE will particularly note the instructor's ability to recognize student difficulties and provide effective, timely instruction and/or corrective action. The SEE should also evaluate the grade assigned and the completed grade sheet or event training form for the student on all initial instructor checks.

3.3.3. The student will perform those duties prescribed by the instructor for the mission/sortie being accomplished. If an actual student is not available, the SEE will identify to the examinee (prior to the mission) the level of performance expected from the SEE acting as the student. If this option is utilized, at least one event or briefing must be instructed.

3.3.4. Periodic INSTR evaluations should be administered in conjunction with required periodic qualification evaluations. The examinee must occupy the primary duty position for an adequate period of time to demonstrate proficiency in the crew position with required qualification evaluations. All instructor evaluations will include a pre-mission and post-mission briefing.

3.3.5. Awarding a "U" in any of the Instructor Evaluation Criteria areas will result in a Q-3 for the overall instructor grade. The overall grade for the instructor portion of the evaluation will be no higher than the lowest overall grade awarded under QUAL.

3.4. Instructor Evaluation Criteria. All Instructor Evaluation Criteria must be observed and graded to ensure a complete evaluation. Specific requirements for each evaluation are as follows:

3.4.1. AREA 20, Instructional Ability (M).

3.4.1.1. Q. Demonstrated ability to effectively communicate weapon system capability, mission planning, briefing/debriefing, employment/ Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTP), and tasked mission areas to the student. Provided appropriate corrective guidance when necessary. Planned ahead and made timely decisions. Correctly analyzed student errors.

3.4.1.2. Q-. Demonstrated a limited ability to effectively communicate weapon system capability, mission planning, briefing/debriefing, employment/TTP, and tasked mission areas to the student. Provided corrective guidance with some errors. Demonstrated limited ability to plan ahead and made some timely decisions. Correctly analyzed some, but not all student errors.

3.4.1.3. U. Unable to effectively communicate with the student. Did not provide corrective action where necessary. Did not plan ahead or anticipate student problems. Incorrectly analyzed student errors. Adversely impacted student progress.

3.4.2. AREA 21, Instructional Briefings/Critique (M).

3.4.2.1. Q. Briefings were well organized, accurate, and thorough. Reviewed student's present level of training and defined mission events to be performed. Demonstrated ability during critique to reconstruct the mission/sortie, offer mission analysis, and provide corrective guidance where appropriate. Completed all training documents according to prescribed directives. Awarded appropriate grades.

3.4.2.2. Q-. Most briefings were organized, accurate, and thorough. Reviewed student's present level of training and defined most mission events to be performed. Demonstrated limited ability during critique to reconstruct the mission/sortie, offer mission analysis, and provide corrective guidance where appropriate. Completed some training documents according to prescribed directives. Awarded appropriate grades for some events.

3.4.2.3. U. Pre-mission or post-mission briefings were marginal or nonexistent. Did not review student's training folder or past performance. Failed to adequately critique student or conducted an incomplete mission analysis which compromised learning. Student strengths or weaknesses were not identified. Adversely impacted student progress. Inappropriate grades awarded. Overlooked or omitted major discrepancies.

3.4.3. AREA 22, Demonstration and Performance (M).

3.4.3.1. Q. Effectively demonstrated all procedures and techniques. Demonstrated thorough knowledge of weapon system/components, procedures, and all applicable publications and regulations.

3.4.3.2. Q-. Demonstrated most of the procedures and techniques. Demonstrated a variable degree of technical knowledge regarding weapon system/components, procedures, and most applicable publications and regulations.

3.4.3.3. U. Did not demonstrate correct procedure or technique. Insufficient depth of knowledge about weapon system/components, procedures, or proper source material. Adversely impacted student progress.

3.5. INSTR Evaluation Documentation.

3.5.1. INSTR Evaluations will be documented as a SPOT evaluation on the ACC Form 4418 and ACC Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualifications* and maintained in the member's cyber crew qualification folder IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, applicable HHQ supplements, and local supplemental guidance. Additional INSTR Evaluation documentation is as follows:

3.5.2. INIT INSTR Qualification Evaluation.

3.5.2.1. If conducted in conjunction with the Instructor Examinee's periodic QUAL evaluation, the INSTR Evaluation will be documented on the same ACC Form 4418, placing SPOT in the second "Evaluation Type" block of Section II Qualification below annotating QUAL. Place a statement in Section IV Comments that the QUAL evaluation was in conjunction with an Initial Instructor Qualification Evaluation. Place any comments specific to the Instructor portion of the evaluation separately from the QUAL portion of the evaluation.

3.5.2.2. If the INSTR Evaluation is not in conjunction with a periodic QUAL evaluation, document the evaluation as a SPOT in the first "Evaluation Type" block of Section II Qualification and place a statement in Section IV Comments that the evaluation was an INIT INSTR Evaluation. Place any comments regarding commendable performance and/or discrepancies for the instructor evaluation in Section V Comments.

3.5.2.3. Upon completion of the ACC Form 4418, place the appropriate corresponding entry on the ACC Form 4420.

3.5.3. Recurring/Periodic INSTR Evaluation.

3.5.3.1. If conducted in conjunction with the Instructor Examinee's periodic QUAL evaluation, the INSTR Evaluation may be documented on the same ACC Form 4418, placing SPOT in the second "Evaluation Type" block of Section II Qualification below annotating QUAL. Place a statement in Section V Comments that the evaluation was a periodic QUAL evaluation in conjunction with periodic or recurring INSTR Evaluation. Place any comments specific to the Instructor portion of the evaluation separately from the QUAL portion of the evaluation.

3.5.3.2. If the INSTR Evaluation is not in conjunction with a periodic QUAL evaluation, document the evaluation as a SPOT in the first "Evaluation Type" block of Section II Qualification. Place any comments regarding commendable performance and/or discrepancies for the instructor evaluation in Section V Comments.

3.5.3.3. Upon completion of the ACC Form 4418, place the appropriate corresponding entry on the ACC Form 4420.

3.5.4. Letter of Certification (Letter of Xs).

3.5.4.1. The Letter of Xs is the list of all the certifications and qualifications for Mission Ready (MR) and Basic Mission Capable (BMC) personnel within the unit. The Letter of Xs is maintained by the unit and is signed by the unit commander.

3.5.4.2. Upon the successful completion of an INSTR Evaluation, units will ensure the crewmembers instructor status is reflected on the Letter of Xs.

3.5.4.3. Upon the expiration of a qualification or failure of an INSTR Evaluation, units will ensure the crewmembers instructor status is reflected on the Letter of Xs.

Chapter 4

SEE OBJECTIVITY EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

4.1. General. SEE Objectivity Evaluations are a vehicle for commanders to upgrade crewmembers for SEE qualification and a tool to monitor the evaluator crew force's adherence to Stan/Eval directives. Grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Evaluator judgement must be tempered with sortie objectives and task accomplishment in the determination of overall examinee performance. The criteria contained in this chapter are established by experience, policies, and procedures set forth in weapon system manuals and other directives and is applicable to all SEE Objectivity Evaluations for AFINC crewmembers.

4.2. Evaluator Upgrade and Qualification Requisites. Evaluator upgrade candidates will be selected from the most qualified and competent instructors.

4.2.1. SEE Upgrade candidate nominations will be approved by the unit commander in writing. Once approved, candidates must complete all SEE training IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, this manual, and all applicable supplemental guidance. As a minimum, SEE training will consist of:

4.2.1.1. Local SEE academics/instruction covering all Stan/Eval programs and procedures. Training completion should be documented on a locally developed, COG/CC approved, checklist along with a signed certificate from the COG/CC or COG/CD. Both checklist and certificate will be maintained in the unit Stan/Eval office.

4.2.1.2. The candidate observing one entire evaluation performed by a qualified SEE. **Note:** To the maximum extent possible, SEE Upgrade candidates should observe evaluations conducted within the weapon system for which they are qualified, however when not practical, the observed evaluation may be conducted with a qualified SEE in the same Group regardless of weapon system or crew position. Training completion should be documented on locally developed, COG/CC approved, checklist and maintained in the unit Stan/Eval office.

4.2.1.3. Completion of a SEE Objectivity Evaluation under the supervision of a qualified SEE. **Note:** The SEE Objectivity Evaluation will be conducted within the weapon system and crew position for which the SEE Upgrade candidate (SEE Examinee) maintains qualification. See [paragraph 4.5](#) for SEE Objectivity Evaluation (ACC Form 4418) documentation guidance.

4.3. SEE Objectivity Evaluations. There is no eligibility period or expiration date associated with a SEE Objectivity Evaluation. Once obtained, crewmembers maintain SEE qualification unless they fail a QUAL evaluation, fail an INSTR evaluation, fail a SEE Objectivity Evaluation, their weapon system QUAL expires, or upon their SEE appointment being revoked/rescinded by the appointing official. See [paragraph 4.5](#) for SEE Objectivity Evaluation documentation guidance.

4.3.1. Only a qualified cyberspace weapon system SEE is authorized to administer a SEE Objectivity Evaluation to a cyberspace SEE examinee. SEE Objectivity Evaluations must be administered by SEEs that are qualified in the same cyberspace weapon system type or crew position from the SEE examinee. **Note:** SEE Evaluators not of the same weapon system could

be used if they have qualified with similar tools/equipment of the same vendor family of weapon systems or tools.

4.3.2. SEE Objectivity Evaluations will not be combined with any other type evaluation.

4.3.3. SEE Objectivity Evaluations will ensure the SEE examinee (for example in the case of a SEE Objectivity conducted as part of a HHQ inspection) observes and grades the entire mission activity of the QUAL examinee. Mission activity is defined as all mission planning, briefing, execution, and debrief activities for the mission/sortie.

4.3.4. The SEE Upgrade candidate or SEE Examinee will brief the qualified evaluating SEE on all observations, grades, commendable/discrepancies (if any), recommended additional training, and other mission related debrief topics prior to debriefing the QUAL examinee and/or examinee's supervisor.

4.3.5. The SEE Upgrade candidate or SEE Examinee will complete the ACC Form 4418 and have the SEE review it for completeness and accuracy. The SEE's signature block and signature (not signature/block of the SEE Upgrade candidate or SEE Examinee) will be entered on the ACC Form 4418.

4.3.6. The SEE will administer a pre-brief and debrief to the SEE Examinee.

4.3.7. For SEE Upgrade candidates, SEE Objectivity evaluations will only be administered for observed INIT QUAL or periodic QUAL evaluations. Additionally, the QUAL evaluation may not be combined with an INSTR Evaluation.

4.4. SEE Objectivity Evaluation Grading Criteria. All SEE Objectivity Evaluation Criteria must be observed and graded to ensure a complete evaluation. The following grading criteria will be used by SEE's when conducting SEE Objectivity Evaluations. A grade of Q- requiring additional training or a grade of U in any area for the SEE Objectivity Examinee will require an overall rating of "3". Cumulative deviations will be considered when determining the overall rating of either "1" or "3". Specific requirements for each evaluation are as follows:

4.4.1. AREA 23, Compliance with Directives (M).

4.4.1.1. Q. Complied with all operational directives and guidance. Complied with all directives pertaining to the administration of a positional and/or instructor evaluation.

4.4.1.2. Q-. Complied with most directives. Deviations did not jeopardize the mission, the effectiveness of the evaluation, or crew safety.

4.4.1.3. U. Failure to comply with directives jeopardized mission effectiveness, effectiveness of the evaluation, and/or crew safety.

4.4.2. AREA 24, SEE Briefing (M).

4.4.2.1. Q. Thoroughly briefed the examinee on the conduct of the evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, grading criteria, and SEE actions/position during the evaluation.

4.4.2.2. 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.

4.4.2.3. U. Examiner failed to adequately brief the examinee.

4.4.3. AREA 25, Performance Assessment and Grading (M).

4.4.3.1. Q. Identified all discrepancies and assigned proper area grade. Awarded the appropriate overall grade based on the examinee's performance.

4.4.3.2. Q-. Most discrepancies were identified. Failed to assign Q- grade when appropriate. Assigned discrepancies for performance which was within standards. Awarded an overall grade without consideration of cumulative deviations in the examinee's performance.

4.4.3.3. U. Failed to identify most discrepancies. Did not award a grade commensurate with overall performance. Failed to assign additional training when warranted.

4.4.4. AREA 26, Additional Training Assignment (M).

4.4.4.1. Q. Assigned proper additional training when warranted. **Note:** If the QUAL Examinee's performance (e.g., Q1) does not warrant the assignment of additional training, the SEE Examinee will verbally explain to the SEE the proper procedures for assigning additional training. This may be accomplished as part of the SEE Objectivity pre-brief or debrief.

4.4.4.2. Q-. Additional training assigned was insufficient to ensure the examinee would achieve proper level of qualification. SEE Examinee's discrepancy or omission was correctable prior to QUAL Examinee debrief and in the SEE Objectivity debrief.

4.4.4.3. U. Failed to assign additional training when warranted.

4.4.5. AREA 27, Examinee Critique / Debrief (M).

4.4.5.1. Q. Thoroughly debriefed the examinee on all aspects of the evaluation. Reconstructed and debriefed all key mission events, providing instruction and references to directives and guidance when applicable.

4.4.5.2. Q-. Some errors/omissions in reconstructing key mission events, in discussing deviations/discrepancies, referencing directives/guidance and debriefing of assigned grades. Did not advise the examinee of all additional training when warranted. Errors/omissions did not adversely affect overall evaluation effectiveness.

4.4.5.3. U. Failed to discuss any assigned area grades or the overall rating. Changed grades without briefing the examinee and/or supervisor. Did not debrief key mission events and/or provide appropriate instruction during critique.

4.4.6. AREA 28, Supervisor Debrief (M).

4.4.6.1. Q. Thoroughly debriefed the QUAL Examinee's Supervisor. Reconstructed and debriefed all key mission events pertinent to the QUAL Examinee's performance, citing references to directives and guidance when applicable. Briefed the supervisor on all discrepancies requiring additional training, downgraded areas, and the overall qualification rating being assigned to the QUAL Examinee. **Note:** If the QUAL Examinee's performance (e.g., Q1) does not warrant a supervisor debrief, the SEE Examinee will verbally explain to the SEE the proper procedures for conducting a supervisor debriefing. This may be accomplished as part of the SEE Objectivity pre-brief or debrief.

4.4.6.2. Q-. Some errors/omissions in reconstructing mission events, discussing deviations/discrepancies, referencing directives/guidance, debriefing of assigned additional training, and assigning of QUAL Examinee grades/ratings with the supervisor. Errors/omissions did not adversely affect overall evaluation effectiveness.

4.4.6.3. U. Failed to discuss any observed discrepancies, assigned area downgrades or the overall rating with the supervisor. Changed grades without briefing the examinee and/or supervisor. Did not debrief key mission events contributing to the QUAL examinees overall performance and assigned qualification rating.

4.4.7. AREA 29, SEE Performance and Evaluation Documentation (M).

4.4.7.1. Q. SEE Examinee performed as briefed and ensured a thorough evaluation of the QUAL and/or INSTR evaluation examinee. SEE Examinee correctly documented the QUAL or INSTR Examinee's performance on the ACC Form 4418.

4.4.7.2. Q-. Minor errors or discrepancies during the mission did not impact or detract from the QUAL or INSTR Examinees' performance. Minor errors/discrepancies in accomplishing documentation.

4.4.7.3. U. Major errors/disruptions impacted or detracted from the QUAL or INSTR Examinee's performance and/or prevented a thorough evaluation. Failure or major errors/discrepancies in accomplishing documentation.

4.5. SEE Objectivity Evaluation Documentation. SEE Objectivity Evaluations will be documented as a SPOT evaluation on the ACC Form 4418 and ACC Form 4420 and maintained in the member's cyber crew qualification folder IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2 and applicable HHQ/local supplemental guidance.

4.5.1. Letter of Certification (Letter of Xs).

4.5.1.1. Upon the successful completion of a SEE Objectivity Evaluation, units will ensure the crewmembers SEE status is reflected on the Letter of Xs.

4.5.1.2. Upon the decertification or loss of SEE qualification, units will ensure the Letter of Xs appropriately reflects the crewmember's status.

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

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

ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*, 12 January 2021

ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization/Evaluation Program*, 12 January 2021

ACCMAN 17-2AFINC, Volume 1, *Air Force Intranet Control (AFINC) - Cybercrew Training*, 18 March 2021

AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, 23 March 2020

DAFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 1 December 2015

DoD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, 1 June 2020

JP 2-01, *Joint and National Intelligence Support to Military Operations*, 5 July 2017

Prescribed Forms

None

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

ACC Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification*

ACC Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualifications*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACC—Air Combat Command

ACCI—Air Combat Command Instruction

ACCMAN—Air Combat Command Manual

AF—Air Force

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFINC—Air Force Intranet Control

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Management Information System

ANG—Air National Guard

BMC—Basic Mission Capable

CC—Commander

CF—Composite Force

CIF—Crew Information File

COG—Cyberspace Operations Group
CTD—Cybercrew Training Device
DAFI—Department of the Air Force Instruction
EPE—Emergency Procedure Evaluation
HHQ—Higher Headquarters
IAW—In Accordance With
INIT—Initial Evaluation
INSTR—Instructor
LEP—List of Effective Pages
MAJCOM—Major Command
MDS—Mission Design Series
MISREP—Mission Report
MR—Mission Ready
MS—Mutual Support
MSN—Mission
NAF—Numbered Air Force
N/N—No-notice
OC—Operations Controller
OGV—Group Standardization/Evaluation Office
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
OPSEC—Operations Security
Q&A—Question and Answer
QUAL—Qualification
RDS—Air Force Records Disposition Schedule
ROE—Rules of Engagement
SEE—Standardization and Evaluation Examiner
SITREP—Situation Report
SPOT—Spot Evaluation
SQ—Squadron
SQ/CC—Squadron Commander
STAN/EVAL—Standardization and Evaluation
TACREP—Tactical Report

TTP—Tactics, Techniques and Procedures

Terms

Air Force Intranet Control Crew Commander (AFINC/CC)—Responsible for AFINC crew operations and provides command oversight for operations floor personnel. Enforces compliance with policies and procedures to ensure successful mission accomplishment.

Air Force Intranet Control Operations Controller (AFINC/OC)—Responsible for management of the operator’s execution of assigned missions/sorties. Multiple ops controllers can be assigned to a crew to manage multiple sorties.

Basic Mission Capable (BMC)—The status of a crewmember who satisfactorily completed IQT, MQT and a full Stan/Eval evaluation, and maintains certification, currency and proficiency in the command or unit operational mission, is BMC. The cybercrew member must be able to attain Mission Ready (MR) status to meet operational taskings as specified in the applicable weapon system volumes. Persons filling a BMC position must be able to meet MR currency requirements within 30 days (90 days for Air Reserve Component).

Commendable—An observed demonstration of exceptional skill and knowledge by a cybercrew member and/or noteworthy ability to perform by the examinee in a specific graded area/subarea, tactic, technique, procedure, and/or task.

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

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

Deficiency—Demonstrated level of knowledge or ability to perform is inadequate, insufficient, or does not meet required or expected proficiency.

Deviation—Performing an action not in compliance with current procedures, directives, or regulations. Non-compliance due to unusual or extenuating circumstances is not considered a deviation. In some cases, momentary deviations may be acceptable; however, cumulative deviations will be considered in determining the overall qualification level.

Debriefed Discrepancy—Remedial action taken by a SEE 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 SEE’s Remarks section of the ACC Form 4418 Comments.

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

Error—Non-compliance with a standard procedure. Performing incorrect actions or recording inaccurate information.

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. See also Joint Pub 2-01 *Joint and National Intelligence Support to Military Operations*.

Initial Evaluation—The first evaluation of any type for a Mission Design Series (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).

Inadequate—Lack or underutilization of available crew aids or resources to effectively or efficiently make operational and tactical decisions, gain/maintain situational awareness, or accomplish a task.

Major (deviation/error/omission)—Detracted from task accomplishment, adversely affected use of equipment, or violated safety.

Minor (deviation/error/omission)—Did not detract from task accomplishment, adversely affect use of equipment, or violate safety.

Mission (MSN) 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 (MR)—The status of a crewmember who satisfactorily completed IQT, MQT, and maintains certification, currency and proficiency in the command or unit operational mission.

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

Ready Cybercrew Program Tasking Memorandum (RTM)—An RTM aligns with the latest Air Forces and Joint Force Headquarters-Department of Defense mission requirements and prioritizes training to meet the Designed Operational Capabilities (DOC). RTM's provide the baseline for commanders to develop realistic training programs to meet all DOC tasked requirements as well as specific unit (Air Forces level) requirements. These programs will have clearly defined objectives and goals that enhance mission accomplishment and safety. RTM's take precedence when there are discrepancies with AFI's.

SPOT—Spot (Evaluation).

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 SEE 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.

Supervised Training 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 ACCMAN17-2AFINC, V1) qualified in that specific cybercrew position. The SEE determines when supervision is required. The type of supervisor, i.e., instructor or designated supervisor, is as specified in ACCMAN17-2AFINC, V1, or as determined by the SQ/CC.

Upgrade Training—Training needed to qualify to a crew position of additional responsibility for a specific weapon system (e.g., special mission qualifications). See special mission event training.

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.