

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

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



14 MAY 2021

Cyberspace

**CYBERSPACE SECURITY AND
CONTROL SYSTEM (CSCS) -
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)

Pages: 25

This manual implements Department of the Air Force (AF) Policy Directive (DAFPD) 17-2, *Cyber Warfare Operations*, and references Air Combat Command Instruction (ACCI) 17-202 Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization/Evaluation Program*. It established the Crew Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) procedures and evaluation criteria for qualifying crew members in the Cyberspace Security and Control System (CSCS) weapon system. It applies to all Air Combat Command (ACC)-assigned or attached CSCS units. This publication applies to all Regular Air Force and civilian AF personnel, members of 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 does not apply to the United States Space Force. 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 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. 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/>. 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. This publication may be supplemented at any level, but all supplements must be routed to the OPR of this publication for coordination prior to certification and approval. The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier (“T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3”) number following the compliance statement. See 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. **Attachment 1** contains a glossary of references and is not mandatory for compliance.

Chapter 1— GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1. General.	4
1.2. Responsibilities.....	5
1.3. Standardization and Evaluation Examiners (SEEs).....	5
1.4. General Evaluation Requirements.	6
1.5. Grading Instructions.	7
Table 1.1. Evaluation Grading Criteria.	8
1.6. Trends.	9
Chapter 2— CREW POSITION EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	11
2.1. General.	11
2.2. Qualification Evaluations:	11
2.3. Special Mission Qualification (SMQ).	11
2.4. General Crew Position Evaluation Criteria.	11
Chapter 3— INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	14
3.1. General.	14
3.2. Instructor Upgrade and Qualification Requisites.	14
3.3. Instructor Qualification Evaluations.	14
3.4. Instructor Evaluation Grading Criteria.	14
3.5. Instructor Evaluation Documentation.	15
Chapter 4— SEE OBJECTIVITY EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA	17
4.1. General.	17

4.2.	Evaluator Upgrade and Qualification Requisites.	17
4.3.	SEE Objectivity Evaluations.	17
4.4.	SEE Objectivity Evaluation Grading Criteria.	18
4.5.	SEE Objectivity Evaluation Documentation.	20
Attachment 1— GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION		21

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. General. This manual provides cyberspace operations examiners and cybercrew members with information to assist with the Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Examiners program, procedures and evaluation criteria used during performance evaluations on operational cyberspace weapon systems. For evaluation purposes, refer to this publication for evaluation standards and Air Combat Command Instruction (ACCI) 17-202, Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization/Evaluation Program*. Adherence to these procedures and criteria will ensure an accurate assessment of the proficiency and capabilities of cybercrew members. In addition to general criteria information and grading criteria, this publication provides specific information and grading criteria for each crew position, instructor upgrade qualification and Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE) objectivity evaluations.

1.1.1. Group Stan/Eval Responsibilities:

1.1.1.1. Is the functional lead for the Groups Stan/Eval program.

1.1.1.2. At the Cyber Operations Group (COG) Standardization/Evaluation (COG/OGV) level, emphasis is on overall unit standardization. Under direction of the Chief of Standardization/Evaluation (OGV), examiners will ensure standardization throughout squadron Stan/Eval functions and squadron-assigned examiners.

1.1.1.3. Will ensure new or modified systems, publications, procedures, and processes are integrated and standardized into Operations Training, Stan/Eval, and Weapon and Tactics programs as appropriate. **(T-3)**.

1.1.1.4. Monitor squadron evaluation trends and request quarterly trend reports.

1.1.2. Squadron Stan/Eval responsibilities:

1.1.2.1. Will participate in COG/OGV facilitated Stan/Eval meetings, summits, conferences and events. **(T-3)**.

1.1.2.2. Will establish procedures for review and quality control of their squadron's Stan/Eval documentation and approved MAJCOM software (e.g., Patriot Excalibur). **(T-3)**.

1.1.2.3. Will submit all waiver requests relating to Stan/Eval and Operations Training to COG/OGV for review and approval at the appropriate authority Cyber Operations Group Commander (COG/CC) approval. **(T-3)**.

1.1.2.4. Will at least monthly, advise unit leadership on unit cybercrew qualification status, requisite completion, and upcoming expiration dates. **(T-3)**.

1.1.2.5. Will quarterly advise unit leadership and COG/OGV on unit trends. **(T-3)**.

1.1.2.6. Stan/Eval will coordinate with Scheduling and Operations Training functions for evaluation preparation and evaluation out briefs. This will assist Operations Training with discussing and preparing for additional training requirements and/or capturing trends that need to be associated with training. **(T-3)**.

1.1.2.7. Will identify SEE and instructor members to COG/OGV when Type 1 Training is required. In addition, provide COG/OGV with feedback after Type 1 Training completion, and coordinate Stan/Eval product development for group standardization efforts. **(T-3).**

1.2. Responsibilities.

1.2.1. Refer to ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, 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, Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) and the National Guard Bureau (NGB).

1.2.2. Refer to ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, 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.

1.3. Standardization and Evaluation Examiners (SEEs). SEEs will use the evaluation requirements contained in ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, and the evaluation grading criteria contained in this manual for conducting all Air Combat Command (ACC) and ACC-oversight units' weapon system performance, Cybercrew Training Device (CTD) and Emergency Procedure Evaluations (EPEs). All evaluations assume a stable platform and normal operating conditions. **(T-2).** Compound emergency procedures (e.g., multiple, simultaneous emergencies) will not be used. **(T-2).**

1.3.1. The COG/OGV will facilitate design and maintain evaluation profiles for each mission/weapon system that includes information on each crew position. **(T-3).** These profiles, approved by the COG/OGV, will outline the minimum number and type of events to be performed/observed to satisfy a complete evaluation. **(T-3).** Evaluation profiles will identify standards set for each crew position outlining event/task requirements. **(T-3).**

1.3.2. All evaluations are divided into four categories Qualification (QUAL), Mission (MSN), Spot (SPOT) and Instructor (INSTR) categories listed in ACCI 17-202, Vol 2. **(T-3).**

1.3.2.1. 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, the 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.

1.3.2.2. During all evaluations, any grading areas observed by the evaluator may be evaluated and documented under the event/task. 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, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification*. **(T-2).**

1.3.2.3. This manual contains a table for the grading criteria for various evaluations. This table includes 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).**

1.3.2.4. Unit examiners may administer evaluations outside of their organization to include administering evaluations between ACC, AFRC and ANG provided written Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)/Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the

affected organizations are in-place. Written MOAs/MOUs shall be reviewed and updated annually. **(T-3)**. After yearly review, units will send the MOU/MOA to the Group and NAF for Situational Awareness. **(T-3)**.

1.3.3. Cumulative deviations will be considered when determining the overall grade/qualification level. The SEE will state the examinee's overall qualification level, review with the examinee the area grades assigned, thoroughly critique specific deviations, and recommend/assign any required additional training. **(T-2)**.

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

1.3.5. All crewmembers for the sortie/crew shift (to include students, instructors, examinees, and evaluators) will participate in and adhere to all required mission planning, mission briefing, mission execution, and mission debriefing requirements. **(T-3)**. All crewmembers must be current on Cybercrew Information Files (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)**.

1.4. General Evaluation Requirements.

1.4.1. 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)**. The publications check will be annotated in the Comments block of the ACC Form 4418 only if unsatisfactory. **(T-2)**. The List of Effective Pages (LEP) and annual "A" page checks in individually issued operating manuals must be accomplished, documented and current. **(T-2)**. Unit Stan/Eval offices will list the required operating publications in the local CIF Library. **(T-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. **(T-2)**.

1.4.2. Written Examinations.

1.4.2.1. The first phase of an evaluation will consist of written examinations. All CSCS crew positions require a closed book examination. **(T-2)**. The closed book exam consists of 25-50 questions derived from applicable operations guidance and governing directives. COG/OGV will determine the necessary number of questions to be included for each weapon system and crew position. **(T-2)**. The EPE is required for all Initial Qualification (INIT QUAL) and subsequent periodic QUAL evaluations covering duties in the member's primary crew position. **(T-2)**. See [paragraph 1.3.3](#) for procedures/requirements for conducting EPEs.

1.4.2.2. The written examinations will be accomplished prior to the performance phase unless in conjunction with a No-Notice (N/N) QUAL. **Note:** A N/N evaluation conducted in the examinee's eligibility period 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 expiration date. **(T-2)**.

1.4.3. EPE. Every Qualification evaluation, which updates an expiration date, will include an EPE. **(T-2)**. Qualification EPEs will evaluate the crewmember's knowledge and/or performance of emergency procedures. 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 (Q&A) techniques. **(T-2)**. Units will determine scenarios for EPEs. **(T-2)**. The SEE will assign an overall EPE grade. 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)**.

1.4.4. Performance Evaluations. The second phase of an evaluation is the performance phase IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 2.

1.4.4.1. Qualification (QUAL) Evaluations. These evaluations measure a crewmember's ability to meet standards from the profile document and the use of evaluation grading criteria areas listed on **Table 1.1** at the end of this chapter and defined in **Chapter 2** of this publication. IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 2 and weapon system-specific guidance, QUAL evaluations may be combined with MSN evaluations. When practical, QUAL evaluations shall be combined with Instructor evaluations, as applicable for the crew position. **(T-2)**.

1.4.4.2. Mission Evaluations. IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, and weapon system-specific guidance, the requirement for a separate MSN evaluation may be combined with the QUAL evaluation. Mission certifications will be IAW ACCI 17-202, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*, ACCMAN 17-2CSCS, Volume 1, *Cyberspace Security and Control System (CSCS) Cybercrew Training*, and all applicable supplements and will be documented in the appropriate training folder. **(T-2)**. MSN evaluation grading criteria areas are also listed on **Table 1.1** at the end of this chapter and defined in **Chapter 2** of this instruction. **(T-2)**.

1.4.4.2.1. For cybercrew members who maintain multiple qualifications, periodic evaluations need to evaluate the profile standards set for those crew positions and special mission qualifications. **(T-2)**.

1.4.4.3. Instructor Evaluations. Evaluation grading criteria areas for these evaluations are listed on **Table 1.1** at the end of this chapter. **(T-2)**. See **Chapter 3** of this instruction for amplified information and grading criteria area definitions.

1.4.4.4. SEE Objectivity Evaluations. Evaluation grading criteria areas for these evaluations are listed on **Table 1.1** at the end of this chapter. **(T-2)**. See **Chapter 4** of this instruction for amplified information and grading area definitions.

1.4.4.5. No-Notice (N/N) Evaluations. The intent is to preclude extraordinary preparation for the evaluation. A minimum of 10 percent of QUAL evaluations given on an annual basis (Calendar year from 1 January-31 December) will be no-notice. **(T-3)**. N/N evaluations will not be initial qualification or requalification evaluations. **(T-3)**.

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

9. Crew Discipline	C	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R		
10. Crew Coordination	N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R		
12. Task Management	N	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R		
Instructor Grading Criteria														
23. Instructional Ability	N												R	
24. Instructional Briefings/Critique	N												R	
25. Demonstration and Performance	N												R	
Stan/Eval Examiner Objectivity Evaluation Criteria														
26. Compliance with Directives	N													R
27. SEE Briefing	N													R
28. Performance Assessment /Grading	N													R
29. Additional Training Assignment	N													R
30. Examinee Debrief	N													R
31. Chief of Stan/Eval Debrief	N													R
32. SEE Performance / Documentation	N													R
C – critical; N – non-critical; R – required														
Note:														
1. Applicable for shift/crew changeovers.														

1.6. Trends. A trend is a statistically relevant deficiency (based on the number of exposures) observed at unit level. A trend is also identified at group level for any deficiency identified across two or more squadrons. The COG/OGV will develop a template to task and capture squadron trend reports. **(T-3).** Trend reports will be sent to COG/OGV on a quarterly bases and consolidated at the group level for standardization improvement efforts. **(T-3).** Trends will also comply with ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, paragraph 3.2.3.5 trend program requirements. **(T-3).**

1.6.1. Trending Process. Units will develop an evaluation trending process to:

1.6.1.1. Document event/task focus points. **(T-3)**.

1.6.1.2. Identify root causes (grading criteria). **(T-3)**.

1.6.1.3. Document lessons learned for trending purposes. **(T-3)**.

1.6.1.4. Ensure all lessons learned are properly reviewed to determine if there is a need for any of the following:

1.6.1.4.1. Update to training materials. **(T-3)**.

1.6.1.4.2. Change to technical data (Air Force Technical Order (AFTO) Form 22, *Technical Manual (TM) Change Recommendation and Reply*). **(T-3)**.

1.6.1.4.3. Recommended change to operational procedures

1.6.1.4.4. If Tactics Improvement Proposal (TIP) should be submitted.. **(T-3)**.

1.6.2. Trends are identified when the number of errors/deficiencies attributed to a specific event/task (given from the evaluation profile) reaches a pre-determined percentage based on the number of times that event/task is exposed during the calendar year quarter (January-December). **(T-3)**.

1.6.3. For trends that immediately affect CSCS operations in critical tasks, before the quarterly report is due, squadrons are to notify COG/OGV for course of action to remedy and prevent re-occurrence. **(T-3)**.

Chapter 2

CREW POSITION EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

2.1. General. The grading criteria contained in this chapter are applicable to evaluations for all CSCS crew positions (as specified) and were established by experience, policies, and procedures set forth in weapon system manuals and other directives. The grading criteria identifies why an examinee committed the deviation/error while performing an event or task during the performance scenario. The judgement of the SEE is highlighted in [paragraph 1.4.4.4](#) where the SEE must exercise judgement when specific situations are not covered in the performance in an event/task and the grading area is subjective. **(T-2)**. Evaluators must realize that grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Written parameters must be tempered with profile standards and, more importantly, event/task accomplishment in the determination of overall cybercrew performance. Requirements for each evaluation are as follows:

2.2. Qualification Evaluations:

2.2.1. Written Examination Requisites: See [paragraph 1.3.2](#). **(T-3)**.

2.2.2. Emergency Procedures Evaluations: See [paragraph 1.3.3](#). **(T-3)**.

2.2.3. Performance Phase: Required Areas 1 through 12 in [Table 1.1](#) under CC, OC, BPO, CPO, DSO, IFO, NMO, SVO, VAO, VMO, and VRO will be used to determine the root cause of the deficiency when performing the events/tasks within the evaluation, unless not applicable as noted. **(T-3)**.

2.3. Special Mission Qualification (SMQ). SMQ ensures individuals are capable of performing duties essential to the effective employment of the mission in addition to crew positions. Mission Certifications are accomplished IAW special mission training requirements and/or SQ/CC directions. Mission certification events are normally performed during Qualification evaluations, 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 unless indicated, regardless of SMQ and additional certifications, and will be used for all applicable evaluations:

2.4.1. AREA 1, Mission Planning (N)

2.4.1.1. 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 to include a review of all Cybercrew Information File (CIF) Vol 1, Part B items with minor errors/deviations/omissions that did not impact mission effectiveness. **(T-3)**.

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. **(T-3)**.

2.4.1.3. U. Failed to adequately lead or contribute to the mission planning effort. Failure to comply with procedures prescribed in applicable guidance manuals, instructions, and/or directives contributed to significant deficiencies in mission execution/accomplishment.

Failed to lead or participate in all required briefings and/or planning meetings without appropriate approval. Failed to review CIF. **(T-3)**.

2.4.2. AREA 6, Situational Awareness (C)

2.4.2.1. 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. **(T-3)**.

2.4.2.2. U. Decisions or lack thereof resulted in failure to accomplish the assigned mission. Demonstrated poor judgment or lost situational awareness. **(T-3)**.

2.4.3. AREA 7, Safety (C)

2.4.3.1. Q. Aware of and complied with all factors required for safe operations and mission accomplishment. **(T-3)**.

2.4.3.2. U. Was not aware 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. **(T-3)**.

2.4.4. AREA 9, Crew Discipline (C)

2.4.4.1. Q. Demonstrated professional crew discipline with attention to detail, to acknowledge and interact with other members throughout the evaluation and associate the impact of their actions (e.g., two person integrity). Planned, briefed, executed and debriefed mission in accordance with evaluation scenario and with applicable instructions and directives. **(T-3)**.

2.4.4.2. U. Failed to demonstrate strict professional crew discipline throughout the evaluation. Violated or failed to comply with applicable instructions and directives, which could have jeopardized safety of crewmembers or mission accomplishment. **(T-3)**.

2.4.5. AREA 10, Crew Coordination (N)

2.4.5.1. Q. Effectively coordinated with other crewmembers and/or teams during the evaluation while 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. **(T-3)**.

2.4.5.2. Q-. There were some breakdowns in communication but they did not detract from overall mission success. Limited in knowledge of other crewmembers' duties/responsibilities. Unclear communication at times caused confusion and/or limited crew/team interaction. Some unnecessary prompting required from other crewmembers. **(T-3)**.

2.4.5.3. U. Severe breakdowns in coordination caused or could have resulted in mission ineffectiveness, failure or jeopardized safety of crewmembers or teams. Lacked basic

knowledge of other crewmembers' and/or teams' duties and responsibilities. Unclear/lack of communication or excessive prompting required by crewmembers or teams put mission and/or safety of others at risk. **(T-3)**.

2.4.6. AREA 12, Task Management (N)

2.4.6.1. Q. Accurately identified, effectively prioritized and/or efficiently managed tasks based on existing and new information. Used available resources to manage workload, communicated task priorities to other crewmembers and/or internal teams. Recognized and requested assistance from other crewmembers when task-saturated. Gathered/crosschecked available data and effectively identified alternatives when necessary. **(T-3)**.

2.4.6.2. Q-. 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 crewmembers and/or internal teams. Slow to recognize task saturation and/or request assistance from crewmembers. **(T-3)**.

2.4.6.3. U. Failed to identify, prioritize or manage essential tasks leading to possible unsafe conditions or significant risk to mission accomplishment. 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. **(T-3)**.

2.4.7. AREA 19, Cyberspace Collection (N)

2.4.7.1. Q. Effective and timely execution resulted in prompt collection of relevant data and information from targeted terrain IAW tasking. **(T-3)**.

2.4.7.2. Q-. Minor errors caused less than optimal data and information collection from the targeted terrain resulting in minor data loss. **(T-3)**.

2.4.7.3. 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. **(T-3)**.

Chapter 3

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND GRADING CRITERIA

3.1. General. The following evaluation grading criteria cannot address every situation. Written parameters must be tempered with profile standards, evaluator judgment and event/task accomplishment in the determination of overall cybercrew performance. **(T-2).**

3.2. Instructor Upgrade and Qualification Requisites. Prior to an initial Instructor Evaluation, Instructor examinees must complete all requisites for Instructor upgrade consideration, nomination and training IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 1, ACCMAN 17-2CSCS, Vol 1, and all applicable supplemental guidance. **(T-2).**

3.3. Instructor Qualification Evaluations. When possible, units should strive to combine instructor evaluations (initial and recurring/periodic) with periodic QUAL evaluations. Instructor 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. See [paragraph 3.5](#) for documentation guidance. **(T-2).**

3.3.1. Initial Instructor qualification evaluations should be conducted with a student occupying the applicable cybercrew position whenever possible. Periodic Instructor Qualification 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. **(T-2).**

3.3.3. The student will perform those duties prescribed by the instructor for the mission/event being accomplished. If an actual student is not available, the SEE will identify to the examinee (prior to the mission) the level of performance to be 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 instructor evaluations may be administered in conjunction with required periodic qualification evaluations. The examinee must occupy the primary duty position for an adequate period to demonstrate proficiency in the crew position with required qualification evaluations. 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 Grading Criteria areas will result in a Q3 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 23, Instructional Ability (N)

3.4.1.1. Q. Demonstrated ability to effectively communicate weapon system capability, mission planning, briefing/debriefing, employment/TTP, and mission/events to the student. Provided appropriate corrective guidance when necessary. Planned ahead and made timely decisions. Correctly analyzed student errors. **(T-2)**.

3.4.1.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies in the above criteria that did not adversely impact student progress. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

3.4.2. AREA 24, Instructional Briefings/Critique (N)

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/event, offer mission analysis, and provide corrective guidance where appropriate. Completed all training documents according to prescribed directives. Appropriate grades awarded. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

3.4.3. AREA 25, Demonstration and Performance (N)

3.4.3.1. Q. Effectively demonstrated procedures and techniques. Demonstrated thorough knowledge of weapon system/components, procedures, and all applicable publications and regulations. **(T-2)**.

3.4.3.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies in the above criteria that did not adversely impact student progress. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

3.5. Instructor Evaluation Documentation. Instructor Qualification 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 cybercrew qualification folder IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, applicable HHQ supplements and local supplemental guidance. **(T-2)**.

3.5.1. Additional Instructor Evaluation documentation is as follows:

3.5.2. Initial Instructor Qualification Evaluation.

3.5.2.1. If conducted in conjunction with the Instructor Examinee's periodic QUAL evaluation, the Instructor Qualification Evaluation will be documented on the same ACC

Form 4418, placing INIT INSTR in the second “Evaluation Type” block of Section II Qualification below annotating QUAL. Place a statement in Section V 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. **(T-2)**.

3.5.2.2. If the Instructor Qualification Evaluation is not in conjunction with a periodic QUAL evaluation, document the evaluation as a INIT INSTR in the first “Evaluation Type” block of Section II Qualification and place a statement in Section V Comments that the evaluation was an Initial Instructor Qualification Evaluation. Place any comments regarding commendable performance and/or discrepancies for the instructor evaluation in Section V Comments. **(T-2)**.

3.5.2.3. Upon completion of the ACC Form 4418, place the appropriate corresponding entry onto the ACC Form 4420. **(T-2)**.

3.5.3. Recurring/Periodic Instructor Qualification Evaluation.

3.5.3.1. If conducted in conjunction with the Instructor Examinee’s periodic QUAL evaluation, the Instructor Qualification Evaluation will be documented on the same ACC Form 4418, placing QUAL 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 Instructor Qualification Evaluation. Place any comments specific to the Instructor portion of the evaluation separately from the QUAL portion of the evaluation. **(T-2)**.

3.5.3.2. Upon completion of the ACC Form 4418, place the appropriate corresponding entry onto the ACC Form 4420. **(T-2)**.

3.5.4. Letter of Certification (Letter of Xs).

3.5.4.1. Upon the successful completion of an Instructor Qualification Evaluation, units will ensure the crewmembers instructor status is reflected on the Letter of Xs. **(T-2)**.

3.5.4.2. Upon the expiration of a qualification or failure of an Instructor Qualification Evaluation, 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 certification and a tool to monitor the evaluator crew force's adherence to Stan/Eval directives. Evaluation grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Written parameters must be tempered with mission/event 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. The criteria contained in this chapter are applicable to all SEE Objectivity Evaluations for CSCS 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. SEE Upgrade candidate nominations will be approved by the SQ/CC in writing. Once approved, candidates must complete all SEE certification training IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, this publication, 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 the training ACC Form 4419, *Record of Training*, with commander signature. **(T-3).**

4.2.1.2. The SEE upgrade candidate observing one entire evaluation performed by a certified SEE who is qualified in the crew position. **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. **(T-2).**

4.2.1.3. Completion of a SEE Objectivity Evaluation under the supervision of a certified SEE. **Note:** The SEE Objectivity 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).**

4.2.2. MAJCOM/NAF. MAJCOM and NAF appointed CSCS evaluators will be qualified in the CSCS weapon system and maintain at a minimum Basic Mission Capable currency/proficiency status IAW ACCMAN 17-2CSCS, Vol 1, and all applicable supplemental guidance. Additionally, MAJCOM and NAF evaluators for the CSCS weapon system will have had previous SEE experience at the wing, group or squadron level in the CSCS weapon system. **(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 certification unless they fail a QUAL evaluation, fail an Instructor 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. **(T-2).**

4.3.1. Only a qualified cyberspace weapon system SEE may administer a SEE Objectivity Evaluation to a cyberspace SEE examinee. SEE Objectivity Evaluations may be administered by SEE Examiners that are qualified in a different cyberspace weapon system type or crew position from the SEE examinee. **Note:** This is common when the SEE Objectivity Evaluation is in conjunction with a HHQ inspection. **(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 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. **(T-2).**

4.3.4. The SEE Upgrade candidate or SEE Examinee will brief the certified SEE Examiner on all observations, grades, commendable/discrepancies (if any), recommended additional training, and other mission related debrief topics prior to debriefing the Chief of Stan/Eval. **(T-2).**

4.3.5. The SEE Upgrade candidate or SEE Examinee will complete the ACC Form 4418 and have the SEE Examiner review it for completeness and accuracy. The SEE Examiner'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 Examiner will administer a pre-brief and debrief to the SEE Examinee. **(T-2).**

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 Instructor Evaluation. **(T-2).**

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- or U will require additional training. **(T-2).** Specific requirements for each evaluation are as follows:

4.4.1. AREA 26, Compliance with Directives (N)

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. **(T-2).**

4.4.1.2. Q-. Complied with most directives. Deviations did not jeopardize the mission, the effectiveness of the evaluation, or crew safety. **(T-2).**

4.4.1.3. U. Failure to comply with directives jeopardized mission effectiveness, effectiveness of the evaluation, and/or crew safety. **(T-2).**

4.4.2. AREA 27, Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE) Briefing (N)

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. **(T-2).**

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. **(T-2)**.

4.4.2.3. U. Examiner failed to adequately brief the examinee. **(T-2)**.

4.4.3. AREA 28, Performance Assessment and Grading (N)

4.4.3.1. Q. Identified all discrepancies and assigned proper area grade. Awarded the appropriate overall grade based on the examinee's performance. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

4.4.4. AREA 29, Additional Training Assignment (N)

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 Examiner the proper procedures for assigning additional training. This may be accomplished as part of the SEE Objectivity pre-brief or debrief. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

4.4.4.3. U. Failed to assign additional training when warranted. **(T-2)**.

4.4.5. AREA 30, Examinee Critique / Debrief (N)

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. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

4.4.6. AREA 31, Chief of Stan/Eval Debrief (N)

4.4.6.1. Q. Thoroughly debriefed the QUAL Examinees performance. Reconstructed and debriefed all key mission events pertinent to the QUAL Examinee's performance, citing references to directives and guidance when applicable. Briefed the Chief of Stan/Eval 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 (i.e., Q1) does not warrant a debrief, the SEE Examinee will

verbally explain to the SEE Examiner the proper procedures for conducting a Chief of Stan/Eval debrief. This may be accomplished as part of the SEE Objectivity pre-brief or debrief. **(T-2)**.

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 Chief of Stan/Eval. Errors/omissions did not adversely affect overall evaluation effectiveness. **(T-2)**.

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 Chief of Stan/Eval. Did not debrief key mission events contributing to the QUAL examinees overall performance and assigned qualification rating. **(T-2)**.

4.4.7. AREA 32, SEE Performance and Evaluation Documentation (N)

4.4.7.1. Q. SEE Examinee performed as briefed and ensured a thorough evaluation of the examinee's INIT QUAL or periodic QUAL evaluations. SEE Examinee correctly documented the INIT QUAL or periodic QUAL Examinee's performance on the ACC Form 4418. **(T-2)**.

4.4.7.2. Q-. Minor errors or discrepancies during the mission did not impact or detract from the INIT QUAL or periodic QUAL Examinees' performance. Minor errors/discrepancies in accomplishing documentation. **(T-2)**.

4.4.7.3. U. Major errors/disruptions impacted or detracted from the INIT QUAL or periodic QUAL Examinee's performance and/or prevented a thorough evaluation. Failure or major errors/discrepancies in accomplishing documentation. **(T-2)**.

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 cybercrew qualification folder IAW ACCI 17-202, Vol 2, and applicable supplemental guidance. **(T-2)**.

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. **(T-2)**.

4.5.1.2. Upon the loss of SEE certification, instructor qualification or crew position qualification, units will ensure the Letter of Xs 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***

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

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

ACCMAN 17-2CSCS, Volume 1, *Cyberspace Security and Control System (CSCS) - Cybercrew Training*, 14 May 2021

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

AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*, 26 October 2015

DAFPD 17-2, *Cyber Warfare Operations*, 27 October 2020

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

Prescribed Forms

None

Adopted Forms

ACC Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew Qualification*

ACC Form 4419, *Record of Training*

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

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AFTO Form 22, *Technical Manual (TM) Change Recommendation and Reply*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACC—Air Combat Command

ACCI—Air Combat Command Instruction

ACCMAN—Air Combat Command Manual

AF—Air Force

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFIN—Air Force Intranet

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Information Management System

AFTO—Air Force Technical Order

ANG—Air National Guard

BPO—Boundary Protection Operator
CC—Crew Commander
CIF—Cybercrew Information File
COG—Cyber Operations Group
COG/CC—Cyber Operations Group Commander
COG/OGV—Cyber Operations Group Standardization/Evaluation
CPO—Client End Point Protection Operator
CSCS—Cyberspace Security and Control System
CTD—Cybercrew Training Device
DAFI—Department of the Air Force Instruction
DAFPD—Department of the Air Force Policy Directive
DSO—Directory Services Operator
EPE—Emergency Procedure Evaluation
HQ—Headquarters
HHQ—Higher Headquarters
IAW—In Accordance With
IFO—Infrastructure Operator
INIT QUAL—Initial Qualification
INSTR—Instructor
LEP—List of Effective Pages
Letter of Xs—Letter of Certification
MAJCOM—Major Command
MOA—Memorandum of Agreement
MOU—Memorandum of Understanding
MSN—Mission
NAF—Numbered Air Force
NGB—National Guard Bureau
NMO—Network Management Operator
N/N—No-notice
OC—Operations Controller
OG—Operations Group
OG/CC—Operations Group Commander

OGV—Operations Group Standardization/Evaluation

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

PEX—Patriot Excalibur

Q&A—Question and Answer

QUAL—Qualification

RDS—Records Disposition Schedule

SEE—Stan/Eval Examiner

SMQ—Special Mission Qualification

SPOT—Spot Evaluation

SQ—Squadron

SQ/CC—Squadron Commander

Stan/Eval—Standardization and Evaluation

SVO—Storage and Virtualization Operator

TIP—Tactics Improvement Proposal

TTP—Tactics, Techniques and Procedures

VAO—Vulnerability Assessment Operator

VMO—Vulnerability Management Operator

VRO—Vulnerability Remediation Operator

Terms

Airmanship—A crewmember's continuous perception of self and weapon system/mission equipment in relation to the dynamic environment of operations, threats, and tasking, and the ability to forecast and execute tasks based on that perception.

Boundary Protection Operator (CSCS—BPO)—Allows/denies/redirects/logs network traffic in, through, and from base firewalls and proxies. Additionally, evaluates, detects, prevents and implements counter-measures to protect network hosts, data, voice, and key mission systems from unauthorized network activity.

Client End Point Protection Operator (CSCS—CPO)—Remediates vulnerabilities and weaknesses identified in cyberspace terrain and associated software suites utilized by Air Force Information Systems and net-centric capabilities.

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.

Crew Commander (CC)—Cyberspace operator qualified to perform crew commander duties.

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

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

Deficiency—Demonstrated level of knowledge or ability to perform is inadequate, insufficient, or short of meeting required or expected proficiency.

Deviation—Performing an action not in sequence with current procedures, directives or regulations. Performing action(s) out of sequence 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.

Directory Services Operator (CSCS-DSO)—Provides authentication and accessibility to clients in the Air Force Network domain.

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

Error—Departure from standard procedure. Performing incorrect actions or recording inaccurate information.

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.

Infrastructure Operator (CSCS-IFO)—Employs both configuration and security policies on network components to enforce policies and techniques that effectively and securely route network traffic.

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

Instructor Supervision—When a current instructor, who is qualified in the same crew position, supervises a maneuver or training event.

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.

Network Management Operator (CSCS-NMO)—Allows/denies/redirects/logs network traffic in, through, and from base firewalls and proxies. Evaluates, detects, prevents and implements counter-measures to protect network hosts, data, voice, and key mission systems from unauthorized network activity. Employs both configuration and security policies on network components to enforce policies and techniques that effectively and securely route network traffic.

Omission—To leave out a required action or annotation.

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

Stan/Eval Examiner (SEE)—A crewmember designated to administer evaluations.

Storage and Virtualization Operator (CSCS-SVO)—Performs backup, recovery, and archiving via storage area networks (SAN).

Supervised Training Status—Crew member will perform weapon system duties under instructor supervision as designated by the squadron commander or evaluator.

Type 1 Training—One-Time or limited nature; contracted with civilian industrial or educational institutions; includes commercial off-the-shelf courses; normally used to train selected personnel to operate and maintain new systems. Often personnel in training are initial cadre and AETC instructors who, upon completion of Type 1 training, return to their technical training wing or training group to develop training.

Vulnerability Assessment Operator (CSCS—VAO)—Identifies vulnerabilities within cyberspace terrain and associated software suites utilized by Air Force Information systems and net-centric capabilities. In addition, identifies and assesses the weaknesses in cyberspace terrain that adversaries may gain/maintain access to the AFNet.

Vulnerability Management Operator (CSCS-VMO)—Identifies and remediates vulnerabilities within cyberspace terrain and associated software suites utilized by Air Force Information systems and net-centric capabilities. In addition, identifies and assesses the weaknesses in cyberspace terrain that adversaries may gain/maintain access to the AFNet.

Vulnerability Remediation Operator (CSCS—VRO)—Remediates vulnerabilities within cyberspace terrain and associated software suites utilized by Air Force Information systems and net-centric capabilities.