

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

**AIR COMBAT COMMAND MANUAL
17-2CDA, VOLUME 2**

11 MAY 2021

Cyberspace

**CYBERSPACE DEFENSE ANALYSIS
(CDA) - STANDARDIZATION AND
EVALUATION (STAN/EVAL)**



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)

Pages: 26

This manual implements and references Air Combat Command Instruction (ACCI) 17-202 Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*. This publication establishes the Crew Stan/Eval procedures and evaluation criteria for qualifying crew members in the Cyberspace Defense Analysis (CDA) weapon system. It applies to all ACC-assigned or attached CDA units. This publication applies to all military and civilian Air Force (AF) personnel, members of the AF Reserve Command (AFRC), Air National Guard (ANG) assigned or attached to ACC, and also to contractor support personnel in accordance with appropriate provisions contained in memoranda support agreements and applicable AF contracts. This publication is not applicable to the United States Space Force. This volume requires collecting and maintaining information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 United States Code (USC) § 552a, *Records Maintained on Individuals*, System of Records Notices F036 AF PC C, *Military Personnel Records System*, and OPM/GOVT-1, *General Personnel Records*, apply. When collecting and maintaining information protect it by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by 10 USC § 9013, *Secretary of the Air Force*. Ensure all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Instruction (AFI) 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and disposed of IAW Air Force Records Information Management System Records Disposition Schedule. This publication may be supplemented at the unit level, but all supplements must be routed to the office of primary responsibility (OPR) of the publication for coordination prior to certification and approval. 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 requestor's commander for non-tiered compliance items. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the 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. Compliance with **Attachment 1** is not mandatory.

Chapter 1— GENERAL GUIDANCE	4
1.1. General.	4
1.2. Roles and Responsibilities.	4
1.3. General Evaluation Requirements.	5
Table 1.1. Crew Position Specific Requirements - Written Examinations.	6
1.4. Grading Instructions.	7
Table 1.2. Crew Position/SMQ Specific Requirements – Performance Phase Evaluations. ...	8
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 Criteria.	10
2.5. Operations Controller Specific Evaluation Criteria.	15
2.6. Radio Frequency Monitoring System (RFMS) SMQ Specific Evaluation Criteria.	16
Chapter 3— INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	17
3.1. General.	17
3.2. Instructor Upgrade and Qualification Requisites.	17
3.3. INSTR QUAL evaluations:	17
3.4. Instructor Evaluation Grading Criteria.	17
3.5. Instructor Evaluation Documentation.	18
Chapter 4— SEE OBJECTIVITY EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	20
4.1. General.	20
4.2. Evaluator Upgrade and Qualification Requisites.	20

4.3.	SEE Objectivity Evaluations.	20
4.4.	SEE Objectivity Evaluation Grading Criteria.	21
4.5.	SEE Objectivity Evaluation Documentation.	23
Attachment 1— GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION		24

Chapter 1

GENERAL GUIDANCE

1.1. General. This manual provides cyberspace operations examiners and cybercrew members with procedures and evaluation criteria used during performance evaluations on the CDA weapon system. For evaluation purposes, refer to this publication for evaluation standards. Adherence to these procedures and criteria will ensure an accurate assessment of the proficiency and capabilities of cybercrew members. In addition to general criteria, this publication provides specific information and grading criteria for each crew position, special mission qualification (SMQ), instructor upgrade qualification and Standardization and Evaluation Examiner (SEE) objectivity evaluations.

1.2. Roles and Responsibilities.

1.2.1. Standardization and Evaluation Examiners (SEEs). SEEs will use the grading policies in ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, *Cybercrew Syandardization/Evaluation Program*, and the evaluation criteria in this manual for conducting Air Combat Command (ACC) and ACC-oversight units' weapon system performance, Cybercrew Training Device (CTD) and Emergency Procedures Evaluations (EPE). **(T-3)**. All evaluations assume a stable platform and normal operating conditions. Compound emergency procedures (multiple simultaneous EPEs) will not be used. **(T-3)**.

1.2.2. Each squadron will design and maintain evaluation profiles for each mission/weapon system that includes information on each crew position to align with parent document, ACCI 17-202, Volume 2. **(T-3)**. These profiles, approved by the Cyberspace Operations Group (COG) Stan/Eval (OGV), will outline the minimum number and type of events to be performed/observed to satisfy a complete evaluation. **(T-3)**. Evaluation profiles will incorporate requirements established in the applicable grading criteria, current tactics and reflect the primary unit tasking. **(T-3)**.

1.2.3. All evaluations fall under the Qualification, Mission or Spot categories listed in ACCI 17-202, Volume 2. Dual/multiple qualification or difference evaluations that do not update an eligibility period, list as Spot Evaluation (SPOT) on the front of the ACC Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification* and explain it was a difference evaluation under "Mission Description." **(T-3)**.

1.2.3.1. 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. **(T-3)**. If a required event is not accomplished during a mission/sortie, COG Commander (CC) (COG/CC) is the waiver authority for the event to be completed in the CTD. This may be delegated no lower than Squadron (SQ)/CC unless otherwise authorized in position-specific chapters of this manual. **(T-2)**.

1.2.3.2. During all evaluations, any grading areas observed by the evaluator may be evaluated. If additional training is identified for areas outside of the scheduled evaluation, document the training required under the appropriate area on the ACC Form 4418. **(T-3)**.

1.2.3.3. 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-3)**.

1.2.3.4. Unit examiners may administer evaluations outside of their organization to include administering evaluations between ACC and AFRC provided written agreements/understandings between the affected organizations are in-place. Written agreements/understandings shall be reviewed and updated annually. **(T-3)**.

1.2.4. Cumulative deviations should 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-3)**.

1.2.5. SEEs will not evaluate students with whom they instructed 50% or more of the qualification/upgrade training or those they recommend for qualification/upgrade evaluation without SQ/CC approval. **(T-3)**.

1.2.6. All crewmembers for the mission/sortie (to include students, instructors, examinees and evaluators) will participate in and adhere to all required mission planning, briefing, execution and debriefing requirements. All crewmembers must be current on Crew Information File (CIF) and meet all Go/No-Go requirements IAW ACCI 17-202 series instructions, this publication and all applicable supplemental guidance prior to operating, instructing or evaluating on the weapon system. **(T-2)**.

1.3. General Evaluation Requirements.

1.3.1. Publications Check. In units where crewmembers are individually issued operating manuals, checklists, crew aids, etc., for use in conducting operations, a publications check will be accomplished for all evaluations. **(T-2)**. If the publications check is unsatisfactory, it will be annotated in the Comments block of the ACC Form 4418. **(T-2)**. List of Effective Pages and annual "A" page checks in individually issued operating manuals must be accomplished, documented and current. OGV will list the required operating publications each crew member is responsible for in the local CIF Library and/or local supplement to ACCI 17-202 Volume 2. **(T-2)**. In units where such resources are not individually issued but made available/accessible for common use, the unit Stan/Eval office will list those items (version and date) and ensure the accuracy and currency of the information contained in those resources. **(T-2)**.

1.3.2. Written Examinations.

1.3.2.1. The requisites in **Table 1.1** are common to all CDA 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 it is done in conjunction with a No-Notice (N/N) Qualification (QUAL). **(T-2)**.

1.3.2.2. **Note:** A N/N conducted in the examinee's eligibility period and meeting all required QUAL profile requirements allows the examinee to opt for the N/N 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 expiration date. **(T-2)**.

1.3.3. Emergency Procedures Evaluations (EPE).

1.3.3.1. Every QUAL which updates an expiration date will include an EPE. **(T-2)**. QUAL EPEs will evaluate the crewmember's knowledge and/or performance of emergency procedures, to include use of emergency equipment. **(T-2)**. Use the Emergency Procedures/Equipment grading criteria for all emergency situations. Use Systems Knowledge/Operations grading criteria to evaluate general systems operation. An EPE will be accomplished orally and may be accomplished prior to the mission with any unit SEE conducting a scenario-based evaluation using question/answer techniques, preferably during the SEE pre-brief with the examinee. **(T-2)**. Units will determine scenarios for EPEs. **(T-2)**. The SEE will assign an overall EPE grade. **(T-2)**. 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	CDA-A QUAL	CDA-OC QUAL
OPEN BOOK (Note 1)	O	O
CLOSED BOOK (Note 2)	R	R
EPE (Note 3)	R	R
<p>R – Required; O – Optional</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p>1. Units may administer OPEN BOOK exams at their discretion, however it is not required. If utilized, exams shall consist of a minimum of 40 questions derived from applicable operations manuals and governing directives. (T-2). OGV will determine the necessary number of questions to be included for each weapon system and crew position. (T-2).</p> <p>2. The CLOSED BOOK exam consists of a minimum of 25 questions derived from applicable operations manuals and governing directives. OGV will determine the necessary number of questions to be included for each weapon system and crew position. (T-2).</p> <p>3. The EPE is required for all INIT QUAL and subsequent periodic QUAL covering duties in the member's primary crew position. See paragraph 1.3.3 for procedures/requirements for conducting EPEs. (T-2).</p>		

1.3.4. Qualification Evaluations (QUAL).

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

1.3.5. Special Mission Qualification (SMQ)

1.3.5.1. SMQ upgrades are separate CLOSED BOOK exams consisting of a minimum 25 questions specific to the SMQ derived from applicable operations manuals and governing

directives. For initial SMQ evaluations that are not combined with the member's periodic QUAL (for the primary crew position), the SMQ exam is the only required exam. Subsequent (periodic) SMQ evaluations should be combined with the member's periodic QUAL, therefore requiring the written requisites to consist of the applicable OPEN BOOK, CLOSED BOOK and applicable SMQ exam(s).

1.3.6. Mission Qualification Evaluations (MSN).

1.3.6.1. IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, the requirement for a separate MSN may be combined with the QUAL. The various procedures and techniques used throughout the different weapon system variants are managed through a training program, which results in a mission certification or culminates with a SMQ. Mission certifications will be IAW 17-202, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*; ACCMAN 17-2CDA, Volume 1, *Cyberspace Defense Analysis (CDA) - Cybercrew Training* and all applicable supplements. Document accomplishment in the appropriate training folder. MSN and SMQ evaluation grading areas are also listed on **Table 1.2** at the end of this chapter and defined in **Chapter 2** of this publication. **(T-2)**.

1.3.6.2. For crewmembers who maintain multiple qualifications, periodic evaluations need only evaluate the primary mission events and profile standards set for those crew positions and special mission qualifications, as long as currency is maintained in all other required training events.

1.3.7. Instructor Evaluations.

1.3.7.1. Grading areas for these evaluations are listed on **Table 1.2** at the end of this chapter. See **Chapter 3** of this publication for amplified information and grading area definitions. **(T-2)**.

1.3.8. SEE Objectivity Evaluations.

1.3.8.1. 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)**.

1.3.9. No-Notice Evaluations (N/N).

1.3.9.1. COG/CC will determine N/N procedures/goals. **(T-3)**.

1.3.9.2. A N/N cannot be combined with an INIT QUAL evaluation.

1.4. Grading Instructions. Standards and performance parameters are contained in ACCI 17-202, Volume 2 and this publication. A three-level grading system is used for most areas; however a "Q-" grade will not be indicated under critical areas. **(T-3)**.

1.4.1. Critical Area/Subarea. Critical areas are events that require adequate accomplishment by the examinee to successfully and safely achieve the mission/sortie objectives and complete the evaluation. 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).

1.4.2. 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 flight examiner, 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).

1.4.3. The SEE must exercise judgment when the wording of areas is subjective and when specific situations are not covered. Evaluator judgment will be the final determining factor in deciding the overall qualification level.

Table 1.2. Crew Position/SMQ Specific Requirements – Performance Phase Evaluations.

AREA/TITLE	Cat	Crew Position		Upgrade	
	C, M, m	CDA-A	CDA-OC	INSTR	SEE
1. Situational Awareness	C	R	R		
2. Safety	C	R	R		
3. Crew Discipline	C	R	R		
4. Emergency Procedures /Equipment		R	R		
5. Mission Planning		R	R		
6. Briefing		R	R		
7. Pre-Mission Activity		R	R		
8. Mission Checks / Checklist Procedures		R	R		
9. Crew Coordination		R	R		
10. Task Management		R	R		
11. Communication		R	R		
12. Systems Knowledge/ Operations		R	R		
13. Reports and Transcripts		R	R		
14. Emergency/Criminal Information Reporting	C	R	R		

15. Classified Message Incident Procedures	C	R	R		
16. Post-Mission Activity		R	R		
17. Debrief		R	R		
18. Mission Management			R		
23. Instructional Ability				R	
24. Instructional Briefings/Critique				R	
25. Demonstration and Performance				R	
26. Compliance with Directives					R
27. SEE Briefing					R
28. Performance Assessment/Grading					R
29. Additional Training Assignment					R, 1
30. Examinee Debrief					R
31. Supervisor Debrief					R, 1
32. SEE Performance/Documentation					R

Chapter 2

CREW POSITION EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

2.1. General. The grading criteria contained in this chapter are applicable to evaluations for CDA Analysts (CDA-A) and Operations Controllers (CDA-OC) and were established 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 must be tempered with mission objectives and, more importantly, mission/task accomplishment in the determination of overall cybercrew performance. Requirements for each evaluation are as follows: **(T-3)**.

2.2. Qualification evaluations:

2.2.1. Emergency Procedures Evaluations: See **paragraph 1.3.3**.

2.2.2. Written Examination Requisites: See **Table 1.1**.

2.2.3. Performance Phase: Areas 1 through 18 in **Table 1.2** under CDA-A and CDA-OC will be evaluated, unless not applicable as noted.

2.3. Mission Certifications. Mission Certifications ensure that 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 QUALs, but may be performed on any mission/sortie with an instructor certified in that mission. **(T-3)**.

2.4. General Crew Position Evaluation Criteria. The following general evaluation grading criteria are common to all crew positions, regardless of SMQ and additional certifications and will be used for all applicable evaluations:

2.4.1. AREA 1, Situational Awareness (C)

2.4.1.1. 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.

2.4.1.2. U. Decisions or lack thereof resulted in failure to accomplish the assigned mission. Demonstrated poor judgment or lost situational awareness to the extent that safety and/or mission accomplishment could have been compromised.

2.4.2. AREA 2, Safety (C)

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

2.4.2.2. U. Was not aware of safety factors or disregarded procedures to safely operate and 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.

2.4.3. AREA 3, Crew Discipline (C)

2.4.3.1. Q. Demonstrated strict professional crew discipline throughout all phases of the mission. Planned, briefed, executed and debriefed mission IAW applicable instructions and directives.

2.4.3.2. 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.

2.4.4. AREA 4, Emergency Procedures/Equipment

2.4.4.1. Q. Recognized emergency situations or malfunctions and immediately demonstrated/explained appropriate response actions. 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 checklists as required. Minor errors did not impact efficiencies in addressing the emergency.

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

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

2.4.5. AREA 5, Mission Planning

2.4.5.1. Q. Led or contributed to mission planning efforts IAW procedures prescribed in applicable guidance manuals, instructions and/or directives. Planning adequately addressed mission objectives and/or tasking. Planning adequately considered intelligence information, weapon system capability/operating status and crew composition/ability with minor errors/deviations/omissions that did not impact mission effectiveness.

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

2.4.5.3. U. Failed to adequately lead mission planning effort. Failed to comply with procedures prescribed in applicable guidance manuals, instructions and/or directives contributing to significant deficiencies in mission execution/accomplishment. Failed to lead or participate in all required briefings and/or planning meetings without appropriate approval.

2.4.6. AREA 6, Briefing

2.4.6.1. Q. Led or contributed to briefing effort as appropriate. Well organized and presented in a logical sequence, appropriate timeframe and professional manner. Effectively incorporated briefing/training aids and presented all training events and effective techniques required for accomplishing the mission. Briefing encompassed all required topics/areas of discussion IAW prescribed directives. Minor errors/omissions/deviations did not impact mission effectiveness or efficiencies. Crewmembers clearly understood roles, responsibilities and mission requirements. Briefed CIF Volume 1 Part B and crew Go/No-Go status.

2.4.6.2. Q-. Led or contributed to briefing effort with minor errors/omissions/deviations. Some events out of sequence with some unnecessary redundancy. Briefing anomalies had minor impact on mission effectiveness but did not jeopardize mission success.

2.4.6.3. U. Inadequate leadership or participation in briefing development and/or presentation. Disorganized and/or confusing presentation. Ineffective use of briefing/training aids. Failed to brief required topics/discussion areas prescribed in directives. Failed to present major training events. Failed to brief CIF Volume 1 Part B and crew Go/No-Go status. Errors/omissions/deviations impacted crew ability to accomplish the mission. Absent from briefing (whole or in-part) without appropriate supervisor approval.

2.4.7. AREA 7, Pre-Mission Activity

2.4.7.1. Q. Initialized and signed-on the workstation. Reviewed all CIF Volume 1, Part B items and complied with Go/No-Go procedures prior to mission start. Demonstrated an understanding of systems and applications, supporting pre-mission activities. Accessed and verified all required mission materials for the crew position to include publications, checklists and working aids. Possessed all required personal and professional equipment in serviceable condition. Used applicable checklists as required.

2.4.7.2. Q-. Deviations, omissions or discrepancies did not jeopardize mission accomplishment, safety or security. Used applicable checklist; however omitted minor items that did not jeopardize mission accomplishment, safety or security.

2.4.7.3. U. Failed to demonstrate an understanding of systems and applications. Pre-mission activities contained errors/omissions/deviations that could have or resulted in significant detractor from mission effectiveness. Failed to review CIF and/or comply with Go/No-Go procedures. Failed to determine/verify weapon system operational state and cybercrew readiness prior to on-watch period or entering tasked vulnerability period.

2.4.8. AREA 8, Mission Checks/Checklist Procedures

2.4.8.1. Q. Performed all mission/operations checks as required. Efficient location and proficient/timely accomplishment of checklists. Adequately ensured, determined and/or verified weapon system operational state and crew 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 checklists 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.

2.4.8.2. Q-. Same as qualified, except minor errors/deviations/omissions detracted from mission efficiencies but did not jeopardize overall mission success.

2.4.8.3. U. Significant errors/deviations/omissions contributed to jeopardizing mission success and/or an emergency/unsafe condition.

2.4.9. AREA 9, Crew Coordination

2.4.9.1. Q. Effectively coordinated with other crewmembers during all phases of the mission enabling efficient, well-coordinated actions. Demonstrated basic 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 gave constructive feedback as necessary.

2.4.9.2. Q-. Minor breakdowns in communication did not detract from overall mission success. Limited in basic knowledge of other crewmembers' duties and/or responsibilities. Some prompting required from other crewmembers.

2.4.9.3. U. Severe breakdowns in coordination led to mission ineffectiveness/failure or jeopardized safety of crewmembers. Lacked basic knowledge of other crewmembers' duties and responsibilities. Unclear/lack of communication with other crewmembers put mission and/or safety of others at risk.

2.4.10. AREA 10, Task Management

2.4.10.1. Q. Correctly identified, prioritized and managed tasks based on existing and new information. Used available resources to manage workload and requested assistance when required. Effectively identified contingencies and solutions.

2.4.10.2. Q-. Minor omissions or errors led to some inefficiencies but did not jeopardize mission accomplishment. Limited use of available resources to aid decision making, manage workload and/or slow to request assistance from other crewmembers when needed.

2.4.10.3. U. Inability or failure to identify contingencies. Ineffective decision making or errors/omissions placed mission accomplishment and/or safety of others at risk. Failed to identify, prioritize or manage tasks leading to unsafe conditions or significant risk to mission accomplishment.

2.4.11. AREA 11, Communication

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. Sound understanding and use of voice, email, chat and collaborative tools to communicate mission essential information. Demonstrated a thorough understanding of Communications Security (COMSEC)/Operations Security (OPSEC) procedures.

2.4.11.2. Q-. Minor errors/deviations/omissions in communications did not detract from overall mission accomplishment.

2.4.11.3. U. Severe breakdowns in communication led to mission ineffectiveness/failure or jeopardized safety of others. Significant COMSEC/OPSEC errors or deviations jeopardized mission accomplishment.

2.4.12. AREA 12, Systems Knowledge / Operations

2.4.12.1. Q. Demonstrated thorough knowledge of weapon system components (e.g., equipment, console, applications, tools and/or software), performance characteristics, proper equipment use and operating procedures. Correctly identified and applied proper action(s) for system malfunctions. Followed all applicable operating directives, guides, manuals, checklists etc.

2.4.12.2. Q-. Minor errors/deviations/omissions did not detract from overall mission accomplishment.

2.4.12.3. U. Demonstrated lack of knowledge in weapon system limitations, performance characteristics, equipment use or operating procedures. Failed to identify malfunctions and/or apply corrective actions. Failed to follow operating directives, guides and manuals resulting in or could have resulted in equipment damage or mission failure.

2.4.13. AREA 13, Reports and Transcripts

2.4.13.1. Q. Recognized all situations meeting reporting criteria. Provided timely, accurate and correctly formatted reports and/or appropriate inputs to information management portals/collaborative databases. Complied with directives, tasking, policy, and security procedures.

2.4.13.2. Q-. Minor errors/deviations/omissions/latency on required reports and database inputs led to inefficiencies but did not affect mission accomplishment.

2.4.13.3. U. Failed to recognize or report situations meeting applicable directives and/or criteria. Major errors/deviations/omissions/latency negatively impacted mission or data analysis. Failed to comply with policy and security procedures.

2.4.14. AREA 14, Emergency/Criminal Information Reporting (C)

2.4.14.1. Q. Recognized/responded to alerts meeting potential unique reporting criteria. Distinguished between Significant Crime and Emergency Situation information and provided timely, accurate and correctly formatted report and/or inputs for all notifications. Performed reporting procedures IAW AF policy and local directives. Used applicable checklists as required.

2.4.14.2. U. Failed to recognize/respond to alerts meeting potential unique reporting criteria. Failed to execute reporting procedures IAW AF policy and local directives. Failed to use applicable checklist or omitted major checklist items that adversely affected mission accomplishment, safety or security.

2.4.15. AREA 15, Classified Message Incident (C)

2.4.15.1. Q. Recognized/Responded to alerts meeting potential Classified Message Incident (CMI) criteria. Provided timely, accurate and correctly formatted report and/or inputs for all notifications. Completed CMI steps to Identify, Notify and Isolate. Performed CMI procedures IAW AF policy and local directives. Used applicable checklists as required.

2.4.15.2. U. Failed to recognize/respond to alerts meeting potential CMI criteria. Failed to execute CMI procedures IAW AF policy and local directives. Failed to use applicable

checklists or omitted major checklist items that adversely affected mission accomplishment, safety or security.

2.4.16. AREA 16, Post-Mission Activity

2.4.16.1. Q. Accomplished and/or supervised timely post-mission checks, system shutdown procedures and workstation clean up IAW applicable checklists, guidance and directives.

2.4.16.2. Q-. Minor deviations, omissions or errors led to inefficiencies but did not affect mission accomplishment.

2.4.16.3. U. Deviations, omissions or errors in procedures jeopardized mission effectiveness, caused equipment damage or endangered others.

2.4.17. AREA 17, Debrief

2.4.17.1. Q. Thoroughly debriefed the mission and/or contributed to the debriefing by reconstructing operational events, comparing results with mission objectives, debriefing deviations, providing individual crew member feedback and summarizing/documenting lessons learned. Organized IAW guidance/directives and professionally presented in a logical sequence using available briefing aids. Used applicable checklist(s) as required.

2.4.17.2. Q-. Led or contributed to debriefing effort with minor errors/omissions/deviations.

2.4.17.3. U. Inadequate leadership or participation in debriefing development and/or presentation. Disorganized and/or confusing presentation. Ineffective use of briefing/training aids. Failed to reconstruct operational events, compare results with mission objectives, debrief deviations, provide corrective crew guidance as appropriate and/or address lessons learned. Absent from debriefing (whole or in-part) without appropriate supervisor approval.

2.5. Operations Controller Specific Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation grading criteria are common to the Operations Controller crew position and will be used for all applicable evaluations:

2.5.1. AREA 18, Mission Management

2.5.1.1. Q. Accurately identified, effectively prioritized and efficiently managed the mission based on tasking/Rules of Engagement, planned information and tactical situation. Identified contingencies, gathered data and clearly communicated task priorities/decisions to crewmembers in coordination with outside agencies. Used available resources to manage workload, monitor crew activity and aid in decision making. As necessary, effectively planned and integrated with Composite Force (CF) or Mutual Support agencies to enhance mission effectiveness and achieve objectives.

2.5.1.2. Q-. Minor omissions and/or errors did not affect safety of crewmembers or effective mission accomplishment.

2.5.1.3. U. Failed to identify, prioritize or manage mission tasks leading to possible unsafe conditions or significant risk to mission accomplishment. Failed to identify contingencies, gather data and clearly communicate task priorities/decisions to crewmembers and outside

agencies. Inadequate or incorrect planning/integration of CF or Mutual Support agencies resulted in mission failure.

2.6. Radio Frequency Monitoring System (RFMS) SMQ Specific Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation grading criteria is for the RFMS special mission qualification and will be used for all applicable evaluations:

2.6.1. AREA 22, RF Collection and Analysis (M)

2.6.1.1. Q. Demonstrated thorough knowledge of RF system components (e.g., equipment, console, applications, tools, and/or software), performance characteristics, proper equipment use, and operating procedures. Correctly identified and applied proper action(s) for system malfunctions. Followed all applicable operating directives, guides, manuals, checklists etc. **(T-3)**.

2.6.1.2. Q-. Minor errors, omissions, or delays detracted from mission efficiency but did not jeopardize overall mission accomplishment. **(T-3)**.

2.6.1.3. U. Demonstrated severe lack of knowledge in RF system limitations, performance characteristics, equipment use or operating procedures. Failed to identify malfunctions and/or apply corrective actions. Failed to follow operating directives, guides and manuals resulting in equipment damage or mission failure. **(T-3)**.

Chapter 3

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

3.1. General. Grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Written parameters must be tempered with mission/sortie objectives, evaluator judgment and task accomplishment in the determination of overall crew performance. (T-2).

3.2. Instructor Upgrade and Qualification Requisites. Prior to an initial instructor evaluations, instructor examinees must have completed all requisites for instructor upgrade consideration, nomination and training IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, ACCMAN 17-2CDA, Volume 1 and all applicable supplemental guidance. (T-2).

3.3. INSTR QUAL evaluations: When possible, units should strive to combine instructor evaluations (initial and recurring/periodic) with periodic QUALs. Instructor evaluations can only be combined with QUALs when the examinee is in their periodic QUAL eligibility period. There is no eligibility period associated with an instructor qualification, however, instructor qualifications expire 17 months after the instructor evaluation QUAL or if an instructor allows their QUAL evaluation to expire, regardless of the number of months from the previous INSTR evaluation. See [paragraph 3.5](#) for documentation guidance.

3.3.1. Initial instructor evaluations should be conducted with a student occupying the applicable crew position whenever possible. Recurring or periodic instructor 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. (T-2).

3.3.4. Periodic SEEs will be administered in conjunction with required periodic QUALs. The examinee must occupy the primary duty position for an adequate period of time to demonstrate proficiency in the crew position with required QUALs. All instructor evaluations will include a pre-mission and post-mission briefing. (T-2).

3.3.5. Awarding a "U" in any of the instructor evaluations 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. (T-2).

3.4. Instructor Evaluation Grading 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 19, Instructional Ability

3.4.1.1. Q. Demonstrated ability to communicate effectively. Provided appropriate corrective guidance when necessary. Planned ahead and made timely decisions. Correctly analyzed student errors.

3.4.1.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies in the above criteria that did not adversely impact student progress.

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

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. Appropriate grades awarded.

3.4.2.2. Q-. As above but with minor errors or omissions in briefings, critique or training documents that did not adversely impact student progress.

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

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

3.4.3.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies in the above criteria that did not adversely impact student progress.

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. Instructor Evaluation Documentation.

3.5.1. INSTR QUALs will be documented as a SPOT on ACC Form 4418 and ACC Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualifications* and maintained in the member's crew qualification folder IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, applicable higher headquarters supplements and local supplemental guidance. **(T-2)**. Additional instructor evaluation documentation is as follows:

3.5.2. Initial instructor evaluation QUAL. Initial instructor evaluations will not be combined with any other evaluations.

3.5.3. Upon completion of the ACC Form 4418, place the appropriate corresponding entry onto the ACC Form 4420.

3.5.4. Recurring/Periodic instructor evaluation QUAL.

3.5.4.1. If conducted in conjunction with the instructor examinee's periodic QUAL, the instructor evaluation QUAL will be documented on the same ACC Form 4418, placing SPOT in the second "Evaluation Type," below the QUAL annotation. Place a statement in comments section that the evaluation was a periodic QUAL in conjunction with periodic or recurring instructor evaluation QUAL. Place any comments specific to the instructor portion of the evaluation separately from the QUAL portion of the evaluation.

3.5.4.2. If the instructor evaluation QUAL is not in conjunction with a periodic QUAL, document the evaluation as a SPOT in the first "Evaluation Type" block and place a statement in the comments section that the evaluation was recurring or periodic instructor evaluation QUAL.

3.5.4.3. Upon completion of the ACC Form 4418, place the appropriate corresponding entry onto the ACC Form 4420.

3.5.5. Letter of Certification (Letter of Xs).

3.5.5.1. Upon the successful completion of an instructor evaluation QUAL, units will ensure the crewmembers instructor status is reflected on the Letter of Xs.

3.5.5.2. Upon the expiration of a qualification or failure of an instructor evaluation QUAL, units will ensure the crewmembers instructor status is reflected on the Letter of Xs. **(T-2)**.

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. Written parameters must be tempered with mission/sortie objectives, evaluator judgment 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. They are applicable to all SEE Objectivity Evaluations for CDA crewmembers. (T-2).

4.2. Evaluator Upgrade and Qualification Requisites. Evaluator upgrade candidates will be selected from the most qualified and competent instructors. (T-2).

4.2.1. Wing/Group/Squadron. SEE Upgrade candidate nominations will be approved by the COG/CC in writing. Once approved, candidates must complete all SEE training IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, and this manual and all applicable supplemental guidance. (T-2). 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 checklist along with a signed certificate from the COG/CC. Both checklist and certificate will be maintained in the unit Stan/Eval office. (T-2).

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 within in the same Group regardless of weapon system or crew position. Training completion should be documented on a locally developed COG/CC 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. (T-2).

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, an Instructor Evaluation, a SEE Objectivity Evaluation, their weapon system QUAL expires, their SEE appointment is 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 will administer a SEE Objectivity Evaluation to a cyberspace SEE examinee. (T-2).

4.3.2. SEE Objectivity Evaluations will not be combined with any other type evaluation. (T-2).

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 higher headquarters inspection) observes and grades the entire mission activity of the QUAL examinee. Mission activity is defined as all mission planning, briefing, execution and debriefing activities for the mission/sortie. **(T-2)**.

4.3.4. The SEE Upgrade candidate or SEE examinee will brief the qualified 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. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

4.3.6. The SEE will administer a pre-brief and debrief to the SEE Examinee. **(T-2)**.

4.3.7. SEE Upgrade candidates, SEE Objectivity evaluations will only be administered for observed INIT QUAL, periodic QUALs, or requalification evaluations. Additionally, the QUAL may not be combined with an instructor evaluations. **(T-2)**.

4.4. SEE Objectivity Evaluation Grading Criteria. All SEE Objectivity Evaluation Criteria must be observed and graded to ensure a complete evaluation IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2. 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". **(T-2)**. Specific requirements for each evaluation are as follows:

4.4.1. AREA 23, Directives Compliance/Understanding

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

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

4.4.1.3. U. Failed to comply and/or understand directives jeopardizing mission effectiveness, effectiveness of the evaluation and/or crew safety.

4.4.2. AREA 25, SEE Briefing

4.4.2.1. Q. Thoroughly briefed the examinee on the conduct of the evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, grading criteria and examiner 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 26, 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 27, Additional Training Assignment

4.4.4.1. Q. Assigned proper additional training when warranted. **Note:** If the QUAL examinee's performance (i.e., 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 28, 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 29, Supervisor Debrief (M)

4.4.6.1. Q. Thoroughly debriefed the QUAL examinee. 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 assigned to the QUAL examinee. **Note:** If the QUAL examinee's performance (i.e., 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 key 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 30, 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 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 examinee's 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 on the ACC Form 4418 and ACC Form 4420 and maintained in the member's crew qualification folder IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 2, and applicable higher headquarters/local supplemental guidance. (T-2).

4.5.1. Letter of Certification.

4.5.2. Upon the successful completion of a SEE Objectivity Evaluation, units will ensure the crewmembers SEE status is reflected on the Letter of Certification. **(T-2)**.

4.5.3. Upon the decertification or loss of SEE qualification, units will ensure the Letter of Certification appropriately reflects the crewmember's status. **(T-2)**.

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

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

10 USC § 9013, *Secretary of the Air Force*

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

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

ACCI 17-202, Volume 3, *Cybercrew Operations and Procedures*, 12 January 2021

ACCMAN 17-2CDA, Volume 1, *Cyberspace Defense Analysis (CDA) – Cybercrew Training*, 11 May 2021

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

DAFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 21 October 2020

Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC §552a, *Records Maintained on Individuals*)

Prescribed Forms

None

Adopted Forms

ACC Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification*

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

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACC—Air Combat Command

ACCI—Air Combat Command Instruction

ACCMAN—Air Combat Command Manual

AF—Air Force

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

ANG—Air National Guard

CC—Commander

CDA—Cyber Defense Analysis

CDA-A—Cyber Defense Analysis Analyst

CDA-OC—Cyber Defense Analysis Operations Controller

CF—Composite Force

CIF—Crew Information File
CMI—Classified Message Incident
COG—Cyberspace Operations Group
COMSEC—Communications Security
CTD—Cybercrew Training Device
DAFI—Department of the Air Force Instruction
EPE—Emergency Procedure Evaluation
IAW—In Accordance With
INSTR—Instructor Evaluation
MAJCOM—Major Command
MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation
N/N—No-notice Evaluation
OC—Operations Controller
OGV—Operations Group Standardization and Evaluation
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
OPSEC—Operations Security
QUAL—Qualification Evaluation
RF—Radio Frequency
RFMS—Radio Frequency Monitoring System
SEE—Standardization and Evaluation Examiner
SPOT—Spot Evaluation
SMQ—Special Mission Qualification
SQ—Squadron
STAN/EVAL—Standardization and Evaluation
USC—United States Code

Terms

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

Cyberspace Operations Analyst (CDA-A)—Cyberspace operator qualified to perform operations analyst duties.

Cyberspace Operations Controller (CDA-OC)—Cyberspace operator qualified to perform operations controller duties.

Cyberspace Training Devices (CTD)—All trainers, computer assisted instruction, sound-on-slide programs, videos and mockups designed to prepare students for operations training or augment prescribed continuation training.

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

Deviation—Performing action(s) not in compliance with current procedures, directives or regulations. Performing action(s) not in 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.

Discrepancy—Any observed deviations/errors/omissions, individually or cumulative, that detracts from the examinee's performance in obtaining a Q for a specific grading area/subarea.

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

Inappropriate—Excessive reliance on crew aids/other resources or utilizing a crew aid/ resource outside its intended use.

Instructor—Crew member trained, qualified and certified by the squadron commander as an instructor to perform both ground and in-flight training.

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.

Omission—To leave out a required action or annotation.

Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE)—A crew member designated to administer evaluations