

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

**COMBAT FORCES COMMAND MANUAL
13-602DCO-S, VOLUME 2**



22 DECEMBER 2025

***Nuclear, Space, Missile, Command and
Control Operations***

***DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE
OPERATIONS FOR SPACE (DCO-S) –
STANDARDIZATION AND
EVALUATION CRITERIA***

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: CFC/S35C

Certified by: CFC/S35C

Pages: 27

This manual implements Air Force Instruction (AFI) 13-602, Volume 2, *Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*. This publication applies to all United States Space Force (USSF) and United States Air Force (USAF) uniformed members, Department of Defense (DoD) civilian personnel, civilian contractors (as applicable per contract documentation), allied mission partners (as applicable per international agreement) performing Defensive Cyberspace Warfare (DCW) operations duties on a Defensive Cyberspace Operations for Space (DCO-S) Weapon System (WS) in support of USSF or a Combatant Command (CCMD). This manual requires the collection and/or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by 10 U.S.C. 9013, Secretary of the Air Force. The applicable System of Record Notice(s) (SORN) F011 AF AFMC B, *Patriot Excalibur (PEX) System Records* is available at: <https://pclt.defense.gov/DIRECTORATES/Privacy-and-Civil-Liberties-Directorate/Privacy/SORNsIndex/DOD-Component-Notices/Air-Force-Article-List/>.

Ensure all records generated as a result of processes prescribed in this manual adhere to AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and are disposed of in accordance with (IAW) the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule, which is located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the Department of the Air Force (DAF) Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Product*; route DAF Forms 847 from the field through the appropriate functional chain of command. This manual may not be supplemented. The authorities to waive wing, unit, or delta level requirements in this manual are

identified with a tier (“T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3”) number following the compliance statement. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate tier waiver approval authority, or alternatively, to the publication OPR for non-tiered compliance items, IAW [paragraph 1.4](#).

Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1. General.	4
1.2. Objective.	4
1.3. Scope.	4
1.4. Waivers.	4
1.5. Certifying Official.	5
1.6. Governing Guidance.	5
Chapter 2—ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	7
2.1. Overview.	7
2.2. Delta Commander (DEL/CC).	7
2.3. Delta (DEL) Chief of Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval).	7
2.4. Embedded Cyber Intelligence Squadron/Detachment Commander.	9
2.5. Cyberspace Warfare (CW) Squadron Commander (SQ/CC).	9
2.6. Senior Line Evaluator.	9
Chapter 3—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS	10
3.1. Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Program.	10
3.2. Spacecrew Evaluations.	10
3.3. QUAL Evaluations.	10
3.4. Proficiency Evaluations (ProVal).	11
3.5. Supplemental (SUPP) Evaluations.	11
3.6. Re-evaluations.	11
3.7. Remedial Action.	11
3.8. Procedures.	12
3.9. Evaluation Requirements.	12
Chapter 4—SPACECREW EVALUATIONS CRITERIA	13
4.1. General.	13
4.2. Examinations and Performance.	13
4.3. Crew Position Evaluation Criteria.	13

Table 4.1.	Crew Position Evaluation Criteria.	13
Table 4.2.	D&CI Scores.	16
Table 4.3.	Threat Mitigation Scores.	16
Table 4.4.	Threat Hunt Scores.	17
Table 4.5.	Clear Scores.	18
4.4.	Instructor Observations Grading Criteria.	19
4.5.	Evaluator Observation and Grading Criteria.	21
Chapter 5—DOCUMENTATION		23
5.1.	Scope.....	23
5.2.	Qualifications versus Certifications.	23
5.3.	Patriot Excalibur (PEX).	23
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION		24

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. General. This manual provides basic Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) criteria for USSF DCW crewmembers IAW AFI 13-602V2, *Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*. Adherence to these procedures and criteria will ensure an accurate assessment of the proficiency and capabilities of spacecrew members. **(T-2)** In the context of this document, “DCO-S WS” can describe either a specific WS (e.g. Manticore, Kraken) or a grouping of similar systems into a single category.

1.1.1. Evaluators will use this manual when conducting spacecrew evaluations and will refer to this manual for evaluation standards. **(T-2)**

1.1.2. This manual provides Stan/Eval processes, requirements, roles, and responsibilities pertaining to evaluation grading criteria for each crew position, instructor upgrade qualification, and unit evaluations.

1.2. Objective. The overall objective of the Stan/Eval program is to provide Commanders (CCs) validation and documentation of spacecrew training, readiness, operational effectiveness, member qualifications, certifications, and capabilities.

1.3. Scope. This manual was developed to define Stan/Eval criteria for DCO-S WSs. It is applicable to all spacecrew members performing DCW on a DCO-S WS in support of USSF or a CCMD. Applicability includes USSF and USAF uniformed members, DoD civilian personnel, civilian contractors (as applicable per contract documentation), allied mission partners (as applicable per international agreement), and other selected personnel performing, instructing, or evaluating Combat Mission Ready (CMR) DCW operations duties on a DCO-S WS.

1.3.1. A DCW spacecrew consists of officers, enlisted, government civilians, and civilian contractors who conduct space operations and are assigned to the DCO-S WS. A detailed depiction of DCO-S crew positions is identified in Combat Forces Command Manual (CFCMAN) 13-602DCO-S, Volume 3, *Defensive Cyberspace Operations for Space (DCO-S) –Operating Procedures*.

1.3.2. Throughout this manual, DCW spacecrews will be referred to as spacecrews. **(T-2)**

1.4. Waivers. Units requiring a waiver will submit a new DAF Form 679, *Department of the Air Force Publication Compliance Item Waiver Request/Approval*, and route it to the appropriate level. **(T-2)**

1.4.1. CFC/CC delegated T-2 waiver authority to the CFC Deputy Commander (CD) in the SpOC/CC Memorandum, *Delegations and Withholding of Authorities*, 23 October 2024.

1.4.2. The following organizations will provide coordination in Section II of the DAF 679. **(T-2)**

1.4.2.1. Squadron Commander (SQ/CC)

1.4.2.2. Delta Commander (DEL/CC)

1.4.2.3. CFC Cyber Warfare Division (CFC/S35C)

1.4.2.4. CFC Training and Readiness (CFC/S73)

1.4.3. Place a copy of approved waivers in the individual's training folder in the current records management system, PEX, or its successor programs. PEX can be accessed at <https://test.omni.af.mil/ePex/Login?location=Login%2FHome%2FSelectPexPerson>.

1.4.4. For more detailed guidance, reference Department of the Air Force Manual (DAFMAN) 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures* or contact CFC Training Branch (CFC/S735T) for questions on the waiver coordination process.

1.5. Certifying Official. The certifying official is responsible for ensuring a crewmember has demonstrated sufficient proficiency to perform all tasks assigned to the newly appointed position (e.g., crew position, instructor, evaluator).

1.5.1. The certifying official is the final signatory of certifications in PEX (e.g., evaluation AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*).

1.5.2. Certifying official responsibilities reside with the SQ/CC. Responsibilities of the certifying official will not be delegated. **(T-2)** For Cyberspace Warfare (CW) Detachments (Dets) that are aligned directly to a DEL, the Det/CC is the certifying official.

1.6. Governing Guidance. SQ/CC and the on-duty Crew Chief will ensure compliance with the operational aspects of this manual and the following instructions specific to DCW: **(T-2)**

1.6.1. Combatant Commander (CCDR) instructions and associated USSF Components directives.

1.6.1.1. The Commander of Space Forces (COMSPACEFOR) standards direct staff and all Tactical Control units on normal, recurring tasks within mission/subject area annexes within their CCMD.

1.6.1.2. COMSPACEFOR standards are effective upon COMSPACEFOR approval until superseded or rescinded. The signature on the COMSPACEFOR standards cover sheet applies to the COMSPACEFOR standards and all annexes.

1.6.2. Operational tasking orders (e.g. Combined Space Tasking Order (CSTO), Cyber Tasking Order (CTO)).

1.6.2.1. Operational tasking orders will take precedence over local Special Instructions (SPINS). **(T-2)**

1.6.2.2. In the case of a guidance conflict, operational SPINS will take priority over the component standards. **(T-2)**

1.6.3. Orders from Commander, United States Space Command and Commander, United States Cyber Command that direct presentation of forces and execution of operations in support of CCDR authority.

1.6.3.1. Planning Order (PLANORD). PLANORDs are planning directives that provide essential planning guidance and direct the development, adaptation, or refinement of a plan or order.

1.6.3.2. Deployment Order (DEPORD). DEPORDs are directives from the Secretary of Defense, issued by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, authorizing the transfer of forces between CCDRs, Services, and DoD agencies. It outlines the gaining CCDR's authority over the transferred forces.

1.6.3.3. Operations Order (OPORD). OPORDs are directives issued by a CC to subordinate CCs for the purpose of effecting the coordinated execution of an operation.

1.6.3.4. Execution Order (EXORD). EXORDs are directives to implement an approved Concept of Operations. It is authorized by the President and Secretary of Defense and may be issued by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at their direction. CCMDs and subordinate components use EXORDs to initiate and execute military operations.

Chapter 2

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Overview. The roles and responsibilities listed below are to be executed at all levels within FLDCOMs, DEL, and CW operational units, unless otherwise stated. CCs at every level are responsible for ensuring the personnel under their command are qualified to perform the DCW mission in a contested, degraded, and operationally-limited environment.

2.2. Delta Commander (DEL/CC). For the purposes of this manual, Delta (DEL) refers to Space Base Deltas (SBD), Space Launch Deltas (SLD), Mission Deltas (MD), or Space Deltas. DEL/CCs are responsible for standardization and evaluation of all spacecrew members in their DEL, to include DCW and their mission area.

2.2.1. The Stan/Eval program is the responsibility of the DEL/CC, therefore all Stan/Eval and Line Evaluators represent their respective CC when performing evaluator duties and share the same roles and responsibilities.

2.2.2. The DEL/CC certifies all evaluators.

2.2.2.1. The DEL/CC designates additional evaluators based on SQ/CC recommendations to meet unit requirements.

2.2.2.2. All evaluators represent the DEL/CC as Line Evaluators when conducting evaluator duties. Line evaluators may conduct all types of evaluations in support of either the training unit or operational unit.

2.2.3. Directs and oversees the Stan/Eval program.

2.2.3.1. Appoints a DEL Chief of Stan/Eval and Line Evaluators in writing based on the recommendations provided by the Chief of Stan/Eval and the SQ/CC.

2.2.3.2. Certifies all Line Evaluators after completion of an Evaluator Certification Course (ECC). The main purpose of certification is to convey the DEL/CC's evaluation philosophy and emphasis areas. The DEL/CC determines evaluator certification methodology.

2.2.3.3. Approves procedures to implement utilization of PEX.

2.2.3.4. Acts as waiver authority for evaluators to evaluate mission and/or skill sets in which they are not CMR qualified.

2.2.3.5. Reviews and approves any local evaluation criteria.

2.3. Delta (DEL) Chief of Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval). The DEL Chief of Stan/Eval is an additional duty and is responsible for oversight of all evaluations and evaluation products within the DEL.

2.3.1. This oversight is necessary to ensure standardization across the DEL. The DEL Chief of Stan/Eval coordinates on all evaluation products produced by Line Evaluators and may supplement Line Evaluators.

2.3.2. The DEL Chief of Stan/Eval reports directly to the DEL/CC.

2.3.3. The DEL Chief of Stan/Eval is responsible for managing the following functions:

- 2.3.3.1. Oversees real-world error investigations; submits investigation results and findings; and recommends corrective actions to the applicable SQs.
- 2.3.3.2. Manages the Operational Review Board processes.
- 2.3.3.3. Establishes and maintains a program to document and analyze trends in evaluations and real-world errors.
- 2.3.3.4. Combines similar discrepancies common to all crew positions to determine trends.
- 2.3.3.5. Establishes procedures to manage the publications program.
- 2.3.3.6. Coordinates and processes applicable DAF Form 847 through Stan/Eval channels. Design evaluation criteria and submit to the DEL/CC for review and approval prior to implementation.
- 2.3.3.7. Develops requirements for the ECC. At a minimum, the ECC will familiarize evaluator candidates on the proper manner to administer evaluations, assess errors, rate evaluations, techniques for evaluation out-briefs, and use of necessary forms.
- 2.3.3.8. Ensures all newly selected evaluators complete the ECC.
- 2.3.3.9. Develops evaluation procedures and guidelines to ensure compliance with evaluation requirements, to include minimum number of evaluations necessary for an evaluator to administer to maintain certification.
- 2.3.3.10. Manages and conducts the ECC and recurring evaluator training program.
- 2.3.3.11. Submits trends and status to the applicable DEL/CC after every Space Force Generation (SPAFORGEN) cycle during the Standardization and Evaluation Board (SEB) until closed. Maintains an archive of trend data for three years.
- 2.3.3.12. Recommends corrective action when negative trends are noted and assigns an Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) and Office of Coordinating Responsibility (OCR). Report mitigation actions and impact of those actions for each trend at the SEB.
- 2.3.3.13. Conducts DEL Staff Assistance Visits (SAV) to ensure units are adhering to requirements under all CFCMAN 13-602DCO-S volumes and applicable CFC/CC and DEL/CC guidance memorandums.
 - 2.3.3.13.1. SAVs will assess unit training, evaluations, operations, scheduling/training documentation section(s), and weapons and tactics programs.
 - 2.3.3.13.2. Detailed SAV execution procedures are approved by the DEL Chief of Stan/Eval.
- 2.3.3.14. Develops recurring evaluator training program for all Line Evaluators.
- 2.3.3.15. Ensures standardization in duration and objectives among operational unit Stan/Eval functions and assigned Line Evaluators by coordinating on all locally developed Stan/Eval products.
- 2.3.3.16. Approves evaluation criteria, based on this manual, for each CMR position in the unit. These criteria profiles will outline the minimum number and type of events to be performed or observed in order to satisfy a complete evaluation.
- 2.3.3.17. Reviews and coordinates on all training products.

2.4. Embedded Cyber Intelligence Squadron/Detachment Commander. The embedded Cyber Intelligence SQ/Det CC, also known as the Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO), is responsible for the execution of the Intelligence function within the DEL and its subordinate units. The SIO will coordinate with MD 6 Chief of Stan/Eval to ensure standardized cyber-related intelligence training and qualification, and intelligence professionals are fully integrated as applicable.

2.5. Cyberspace Warfare (CW) Squadron Commander (SQ/CC). This section includes both Force Generation and Institutional Force Squadrons and Detachments. Most operational units generating forces through employment of DCO-S to perform DCW are Cyberspace Squadrons (CYS). However, some DCW units are Dets, and in those cases, the Det/CC is responsible for all SQ/CC responsibilities outlined in this manual. Any of the following responsibilities will be assumed at a higher level in situations where a SQ Stan/Eval function does not exist. SQ/CCs will ensure all provisions of AFI 13-602V2 are adhered to, with the addition of the following:

2.5.1. Appoints a Line Evaluator as Senior Line Evaluator.

2.5.2. Directs supplemental (SUPP) evaluations when necessary.

2.5.3. The SQ/CC certifies spacecrew members in duty positions following successful completion of Qualification Training (QT), Requalification Training (RqT), or Upgrade Training (UT).

2.6. Senior Line Evaluator. In addition to responsibilities outlined in AFI 13-602V2, Senior Line Evaluator responsibilities include:

2.6.1. Acts as liaison with DEL Chief of Stan/Eval.

2.6.2. Oversees all evaluation activities at the unit level.

2.6.3. Assists DEL Chief of Stan/Eval in implementing the spacecrew publications program IAW Technical Order (TO) 00-5-1, *AF Technical Order System*, available at <https://etims.cce.af.mil/ETIMS/index>.

2.6.4. Assists DEL Chief of Stan/Eval by providing Line Evaluators for evaluator currency tracking, initial qualification evaluations, Proficiency Evaluations (ProVal), Crew Readiness Verifications (CRV), Ready Spacecrew Program (RSP) Combat Training Mission (CTM) error investigations, and trend analysis.

2.6.5. Maintains and tracks the updated list of local crew aids necessary to the success of the mission.

2.6.6. Provides unit data to the SEB.

2.6.7. Performs PEX updates to include any changes in personnel status, certification(s), evaluation(s), Crew Information File (CIF), and Temporary Procedures administration.

2.6.8. Performs monthly PEX audits.

2.6.9. Tracks and reports SQ's CMR status to SQ/CC.

2.6.10. Maintains a backup method (e.g., printouts, excel) to track the information in PEX.

2.6.11. Tracks fix actions to debriefs, works with weapons and tactics on collection and presentation of debriefs.

Chapter 3

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

3.1. Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Program. The spacecrew Stan/Eval Program utilizes operations evaluations to ensure qualification of DCO-S operators and standardization of operations. In concert with training, evaluation is key to identifying readiness shortfalls and is a critical measure of training program effectiveness.

3.1.1. Evaluations will be conducted by a certified evaluator who is current and qualified in the same tasks and subtasks of the evaluatee on the DCO-S WS. **(T-2)**

3.1.2. Individual spacecrew members will be informed whenever they are under evaluation. **(T-2)**

3.1.3. Tasks observed during an evaluation will count toward currency requirements for the evaluator(s), instructor(s), and evaluatee(s). **(T-2)**

3.1.4. When performing evaluations on a live system and conducting simulated actions in a real-world environment, evaluators will utilize applicable procedures and current intelligence to mitigate any operational impact. **(T-2)** Final decision to conduct evaluations on the live system is at the discretion of the on-duty DCW Crew Chief.

3.1.5. Evaluators will not evaluate trainees with whom they have instructed over 50% of the Recurring Training (RT) or Combat Training (CT). **(T-2)** Additionally, evaluators will not conduct the Qualification (QUAL) Evaluation for those they recommend for Positional UT without SQ/CC approval. **(T-2)**

3.1.6. Evaluators will not evaluate direct supervisors without SQ/CC approval. **(T-2)**

3.2. Spacecrew Evaluations. There are four types of spacecrew evaluations: QUAL Evaluations, ProVal, SUPP Evaluations, and Re-evaluations.

3.3. QUAL Evaluations. QUAL Evaluations are administered to ensure qualification in a space operations crew position to achieve Basic Mission Qualified (BMQ). These evaluations qualify a spacecrew member to perform the duties of a particular crew position on the WS. An evaluation is required to attain BMQ status; however, spacecrew members do not require an additional QUAL Evaluation to change between BMQ and CMR status. To become CMR, spacecrew members must comply with CT and RT requirements and any additional guidance specified by the RSP Tasking Memorandum (RTM). **(T-2)**

3.3.1. QUAL Evaluations will be administered upon completion of: **(T-2)**

3.3.1.1. QT.

3.3.1.2. Positional UT.

3.3.1.3. RqT.

3.3.2. QUAL Evaluations are conducted using operationally realistic scenarios. QUAL Evaluations provide a sufficient sample of critical and non-critical tasks to assess the evaluatee's knowledge and proficiency.

3.3.3. Spacecrew members under QUAL Evaluations must conduct at least 75% of critical tasks from the BMQ Master Task List (MTL) for the individual's position. **(T-2)**

3.3.4. To optimize resource use, conduct individual QUAL evaluations collectively as a crew whenever feasible.

3.3.5. QUAL Evaluations include a mission debriefing led by the senior spacecrew member under evaluation and active participation of spacecrew members under evaluation. The debriefing includes an assessment of the quality of mission planning, mission execution, and identification of mission deficiencies (if any). Spacecrew members will identify the root cause of identified deficiencies, lessons learned, and appropriate corrective actions. **(T-2)** An unsatisfactory debriefing may result in a downgraded evaluation rating, to include Unqualified (U).

3.4. Proficiency Evaluations (ProVal). ProVals are used on a recurring basis to ensure individual spacecrew proficiency and compliance with established procedures and standards for a given spacecrew position.

3.4.1. ProVals are conducted by Line Evaluators using offline simulators, real-world systems, or any combination necessary to ensure sufficient task coverage. Each spacecrew member must receive a ProVal within 12 months of their last QUAL or ProVal in the position(s) for which they are qualified. **(T-2)**

3.4.2. Spacecrew members qualified in more than one CMR position must receive a ProVal in each position to maintain BMQ and CMR status. **(T-2)** However, similar tasks are not required to be evaluated multiple times.

3.4.3. Failure to successfully complete a ProVal will result in spacecrew members being non-current and Non-Combat Mission Ready (N-CMR) in that position on the first day of the 13th month following the previous QUAL or ProVal. **(T-2)**

3.5. Supplemental (SUPP) Evaluations. SUPP Evaluations are used by CCs to ensure standardization of operations and to identify and evaluate implemented solutions to operational problems (e.g., new systems, negative evaluation trends, negative operational trends). The form and content of a SUPP evaluation is at the discretion of the SQ/CC.

3.5.1. Execution. SUPP evaluations are different than crewmember QUAL Evaluations because they are more limited in scope and duration.

3.5.2. The SQ/CC directing the SUPP evaluation determines the areas for evaluation based on recommendation from the DEL Chief of Stan/Eval or Senior Line Evaluator. The Chief of Stan/Eval or Senior Line Evaluator determines the method of evaluation, is responsible for administrative management of data collection, and reports results as directed by the CC.

3.5.3. Each SUPP evaluation resets periodic evaluation currency provided they meet or exceed ProVal requirements.

3.6. Re-evaluations. Re-evaluations are used to evaluate spacecrew members after completion of all remedial actions resulting from a Qualification Level 3 (Q3) evaluation rating. Re-evaluation scripts must, at a minimum, include all tasks graded U. **(T-2)**

3.7. Remedial Action. All grades of Qualified-minus (Q-) or U require action to remedy the deficiency in knowledge or performance. Remedial actions may include:

3.7.1. At the discretion of the evaluator, minor remedial re-training may be accomplished by the evaluator during the outbrief.

3.7.2. For Q- only, if an evaluatee self-identifies the deviation during the evaluation debrief and, in the evaluator's judgment, demonstrates thorough understanding of correct procedures, root cause, and fix actions, no remedial action is required for that deviation.

3.8. Procedures.

3.8.1. Evaluators will use the grading procedures contained in AFI 13-602V2 and the evaluation criteria in this instruction to conduct all evaluations. **(T-2)** All evaluations assume a stable platform and normal operating conditions.

3.8.2. All evaluations fall under the categories listed in AFI 13-602V2.

3.8.3. During evaluations, all events observed by the evaluator will be evaluated. **(T-2)**

3.8.4. Consider momentary deviations or cumulative deviations when determining the overall grade. The evaluator will state the examinee's overall rating, review with the examinee the area grades assigned, thoroughly critique specific deviations, and assign any required additional training. **(T-2)**

3.8.5. All spacecrew members participating in the evaluation (to include trainees, instructors, examinees, and evaluators) will participate in and adhere to all required mission planning, mission briefing, mission execution, and mission debriefing requirements. **(T-2)** All spacecrew members must be current on CIF and meet CMR requirements IAW CFCMAN 13-602DCO-S, Volume 1, *Defensive Cyberspace Operations for Space (DCO-S) –Training*, and any applicable SUPP guidance prior to operating, instructing, or evaluating on the DCO-S WS. **(T-2)**

3.9. Evaluation Requirements.

3.9.1. Evaluators will ensure all required publications (e.g., evaluation scripts, binders) are available and current prior to starting an evaluation. **(T-2)** The DEL Chief of Stan/Eval will maintain a list of all required evaluation materials. **(T-2)**

3.9.2. Every QUAL Evaluation will include local procedure tasks. **(T-2)** Evaluations will assess the crewmember's knowledge and/or performance of local procedures, to include use of emergency equipment. **(T-2)**

3.9.3. QUAL Evaluations measure a spacecrew member's ability to meet proficiency standards aligned to grading areas IAW AFI 13-602V2 and WS-specific guidance.

3.9.4. QUAL and ProVal Evaluations will be based on tasks from the BMQ MTL and will be IAW DAFGM 2025-13-01 Volume 1, *Ready Spacecrew Program Training*, CFCMAN 13-602 DCO-SV1, and all applicable supplements, and will be documented in the appropriate training folder. **(T-2)**

3.9.5. Grading areas for evaluations must satisfy all requirements from AFI 13-602V2 and WS-specific guidance. **(T-2)**

3.9.6. The Chief of Stan/Eval at the DEL level, in coordination with SQ/CCs, will determine no-notice evaluation procedures and objectives. **(T-2)**

Chapter 4

SPACECREW EVALUATIONS CRITERIA

4.1. General. The grading criteria contained in this chapter apply to evaluations for DCO-S spacecrew operators. These criteria were derived from experience, policies, and procedures set forth in WS manuals and other directives. Evaluators should realize that grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Written parameters must be tempered with mission objectives and task accomplishment in the determination of overall spacecrew performance. **(T-2)** Requirements for each evaluation are detailed throughout this chapter.

4.2. Examinations and Performance.

4.2.1. Examinations. Operational units will develop written examinations to test CMR crewmembers on Academic (ACAD) tasks from the CT MTL. **(T-2)**

4.2.2. Performance. The evaluator will follow a pre-planned and approved script and/or scenario to evaluate a member and ensure standardization and consistency of evaluations across the WS. **(T-2)**

4.3. Crew Position Evaluation Criteria. Evaluation grading criteria are common to all crew positions and will be used for all applicable evaluations. **(T-2)** Reference AFI 13-602V2 paragraph 4.5 for definitions and guidance on grading and qualifications levels. Failure to satisfy all requirements in a Qualified (Q) will result in a Q- or a U grade. **(T-2)** The areas listed in **Table 4.1** below are derived from BMQ and CT MTL and will be evaluated with criteria described in the following sections. **(T-2)**

Table 4.1. Crew Position Evaluation Criteria.

AREA/TITLE	CREW POSITION			UPGRADE	
	CDO	IR	Crew Chief	INSTR	EVALTR
1. Plan, Brief, Execute, Debrief (PBED)	R	R	C		
2. Operator Fundamentals	R	C	R		
3. System Fundamentals	C	C	R		
4. Battlespace Awareness	R	R	C		
5. Discover & Counter Infiltration (D&CI)	R	C	R		
6. Cyber Threat Emulation (CTE)		R			
7. Threat Mitigation			R		
8. Enable Hardening	R	R			
9. Threat Hunt	C	C			
10. Assessment	R	R			
11. Clear	R	C			
12. Crew Leadership			C		
13. Mission Reporting		R	C		
14. Safety	R	R	R		
15. Crew Discipline	R	R	R		
Line Instructor Observation Criteria					
A. Instructional Ability				R	

AREA/TITLE	CREW POSITION			UPGRADE	
	CDO	IR	Crew Chief	INSTR	EVALTR
B. Classroom Utilization / Presentation				C	
C. Demonstration and Performance				C	
Line Evaluator Objectivity Evaluation Criteria					
A. Compliance with Stan/Eval Directives					C
B. Stan/Eval (Examiner) Briefing					R
C. Performance Assessment Grading					R
D. Assessment of Overall Performance					R
E. Mission Critique					R
<p>Note: Crewmembers filling Mission Planning Cell (MPC) or Mission Support Cell (MSC) positions are also responsible for all areas related to their CMR crew position (Cyberspace Defense Operator (CDO), Incident Responder (IR), or Crew Chief).</p> <p>C = Critical R = Required</p>					

4.3.1. Area 1, Plan Brief Execute Debrief.

4.3.1.1. Q. Operator will develop and brief a plan to execute one or more of the DCW mission activities: Continuous Monitoring, Threat Hunt, Enable Hardening, Assessment, Clear. **(T-2)** Assured mission success by accurately identifying, effectively prioritizing, and efficiently managing orders and dynamic taskings based on planned and updated information. Operator's plan is adequate for mission accomplishment and well documented, to include the following: adversary Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTP); enemy Course of Action (eCOA); systems to be searched, hardened and/or assessed; capabilities to be utilized; No-Strike list; review of Pre-Approved Actions and Pre-Coordinated Actions; and contingencies. Operator identified contingencies, gathered data, formulated decisions, and communicated effectively with space and cyberspace operations crews. Operator clearly communicated task priorities and updates to crewmembers. Operator used available resources necessary to manage workload, monitor crew activity, and aid in decision making.

4.3.1.1.1. CDO/IR identifies opportunities for advancement in tactical employment skills and suggests viable methods of improvement.

4.3.1.1.2. Crew Chief leads assigned CDOs to review Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) and/or Measures of Performance (MOP) and accurately self-assess execution. Crew Chief assists in identifying areas for improvement and creating pathways to enhance tactical employment skills.

4.3.1.2. U. Operator fails to prepare, brief, execute and debrief an adequate plan. Operator did not assure mission success. Operator failed to effectively prioritize and manage orders and dynamic taskings. Operator failed to identify contingencies, gather data or formulate decisions. Operator did not clearly communicate tasks and updates. Operator misrepresents or omits too many details from assigned mission. Operator fails to determine initial detection/scoping actions, assign crew tasks/actions/responsibilities, or set phases and timing for execution plan. Operator fails to establish MOEs/MOPs for detection, scoping,

clear, and Command and Control. Operator fails to organize Check In, Brief, Execution, and Debrief cycle for Mission Plan. Operator did not clearly outline mission objectives, crew roles, or tactical tasks to achieve the overall objective. Crewmembers were unsure of the path to completion when reading/reviewing plan. Operator is unable to explain plan in depth.

- 4.3.1.2.1. CDO/IR fails to identify opportunities for advancement in tactical employment of skills.
 - 4.3.1.2.2. Crew Chief fails to lead assigned CDO/IR to review MOEs/MOPs. Crew Chief is not able to identify opportunities for advancement in tactical employment of skills.
- 4.3.2. Area 2, Operator Fundamentals.
- 4.3.2.1. Q. Operator reports Go/No-Go status. Operator can log into all accounts necessary to perform operations. Operator submits acknowledgement of assigned mission.
 - 4.3.2.2. U. Operator failed to report Go/No-Go status or fails to take appropriate follow-on actions to achieve “Go”. Operator cannot log into all accounts necessary to perform operations. Operator fails to acknowledge assigned mission.
- 4.3.3. Area 3, System Fundamentals.
- 4.3.3.1. Q. Operator understands basic DCO-S capabilities and limitations and effectively utilizes DCO-S in-band and out-of-band capabilities to accomplish mission.
 - 4.3.3.2. U. Operator failed to effectively utilize DCO-S in-band and out-of-band capabilities to accomplish mission.
- 4.3.4. Area 4, Battlespace Awareness.
- 4.3.4.1. Q. Operator understands basic DCO-S, Defended Mission Area, Cyber-related Intelligence, and Mission Relevant Terrain – Cyber (MRT-C) knowledge.
 - 4.3.4.1.1. MRT-C status: Lists enclaves, outages, degradations, and periods of interest across MRT-C and describe space operations impacts.
 - 4.3.4.1.2. DCO-S status: Lists sensor/tool degradations or gaps in coverage or visibility and describe tactical impacts.
 - 4.3.4.1.3. Enemy TTPs: Technical description of known adversary behaviors and at least one method of detection.
 - 4.3.4.2. U. Operator failed to provide assigned information. Operator jeopardized mission accomplishment by not maintaining Battlespace Awareness.
- 4.3.5. Area 5, Discover & Counter Infiltration (D&CI) (see [Table 4.2](#)).
- 4.3.5.1. Q. Operator analyzes details of mission and prepares/executes a plan that:
 - 4.3.5.1.1. Summarizes suspicious activity and impacted blue space hosts/enclaves via Internet Protocol (IP) address and potential space operations impacts.
 - 4.3.5.1.2. Establishes an initial list of blue space hosts and IPs to engage and investigate.

- 4.3.5.1.3. Sets minimum detection actions to execute against blue space hosts and IPs.
- 4.3.5.1.4. Establishes an initial list of Indicators of Compromise (IOC) and/or Indicators of Attack (IOA) for mitigation actions.
- 4.3.5.1.5. Sets mission phases and timing, and assigns crew tasks and responsibilities.
- 4.3.5.1.6. Sets manning based on expected detection, mitigation, and clear action task load.
- 4.3.5.1.7. Sets detection, mitigation, clear, and Command and Control MOEs/MOPs.
- 4.3.5.2. U. Operator fails to determine initial detection and/or mitigation actions, execute crew tasks and responsibilities, or set phases and timing for execution. Operator fails to establish MOE/MOPs for detection, mitigation, clear, and Command and Control.

Table 4.2. D&CI Scores.

SCORE	CRITERIA	PARAMETERS
Q	TIME	<= 120 min
	ACCURACY	<= 2 errors; Operator analysis is Reliable .
U		Did not meet Q- effectiveness rating; Operator analysis is Not Reliable .
Operator must conduct analysis to determine compromise state of at least 5 endpoints. Errors occur when operator mischaracterizes endpoints. For example, labelling an uncompromised endpoint as compromised (False Positive) or labelling a compromised endpoint as uncompromised (False Negative).		

4.3.6. Area 6, Cyber Threat Emulation (CTE).

- 4.3.6.1. Q. Operator effectively emulated adversary TTPs to assess and enhance detection capability and ensure mission accomplishment.
- 4.3.6.2. U. Operator failed to effectively emulate adversary TTPs on DCO-S or mission terrain.

4.3.7. Area 7, Threat Mitigation (see [Table 4.3](#)).

Table 4.3. Threat Mitigation Scores.

SCORE	CRITERIA	PARAMETERS
Q	TIME	<= 8 min
	ACCURACY	>= 75% of associated endpoints discovered
U		Did not meet Q- effectiveness rating
Operator will locate endpoints associated with one of the following IOCs to execute threat mitigation actions: Domain Name, Port, IP address, User Account, Process, File, or Registry Key.		
Evaluator will use discretion with timing for Q, Q-, U criteria. (i.e., Don't grant a U for exceeding time limits when toolkit took abnormally long to load/perform as expected).		
Time thresholds are based on initial trials of operator performance.		

4.3.8. Area 8, Enable Hardening.

4.3.8.1. Q. Operator performed the following packet, vulnerability scan, and log analysis, and recognized all situations meeting hardening recommendation criteria. As required, operator provided timely, accurate, correctly formatted recommendations and communicated with external agencies and/or mission partners.

4.3.8.1.1. Operator determined details for a given packet capture file.

4.3.8.1.2. Operator collected log files for a given endpoint.

4.3.8.1.3. Operator determined details for a given log file.

4.3.8.1.4. Operator determined details from a given vulnerability scan, and prioritized vulnerabilities based on adversary TTPs.

4.3.8.2. Q-. Operator performed the following actions without jeopardizing task accomplishment:

4.3.8.2.1. Determined details for a given packet capture file with errors, omissions, or delays.

4.3.8.2.2. Collected log files for a given endpoint with errors, omissions, or delays.

4.3.8.2.3. Determined details for a given log file with errors, omissions, or delays.

4.3.8.2.4. Determined details from a given vulnerability scan with errors, omissions, or delays.

4.3.8.3. U. Operator's performance shortcomings jeopardized task accomplishment.

4.3.9. Area 9, Threat Hunt (see [Table 4.4.](#)).**Table 4.4. Threat Hunt Scores.**

SCORE	CRITERIA	PARAMETERS
Q	TIME	<= 240 min
	EFFECTIVENESS	>= 75% detection TTPs deployed against designated blue space hosts/IPs
		>= 75% of compromised endpoints discovered and contained
U		Did not meet Q- effectiveness rating
Operator must lead crew through deployment of detection TTPs associated with hunt plan.		
Operator must execute and lead crew through detection and scoping actions to accurately detect and characterize adversary control of 2 to 5 endpoints associated with an intrusion.		

4.3.10. Area 10, Assessment.

4.3.10.1. Q. Based on threat emulation, operator accurately identified and executed detection rule updates to optimize detection capability.

4.3.10.2. Q-. Operator's performance included errors or omissions that did not jeopardize mission accomplishment.

4.3.10.3. U. Operator's performance shortcomings jeopardized task accomplishment.

4.3.11. Area 11, Clear (see [Table 4.5.](#)).

Table 4.5. Clear Scores.

SCORE	CRITERIA	PARAMETERS
Q	PHASE 1 TIME	<= 120 min
	EFFECTIVENESS	>= 75% of compromised endpoints discovered and contained/cleared
	PHASE 2 TIME	<= 120 min
	ACCURACY	>= 75% of adversary actions on compromised endpoints determined
U		Did not meet Q- effectiveness rating
Phase 1: Operator must execute and lead crew through detection, scoping, and clear actions to find and kill adversary control of 2 to 5 endpoints associated with an intrusion.		
Phase 2: Operator must execute and lead crew through root cause analysis of endpoints associated with an intrusion to determine initial access and enemy actions on objective.		

4.3.12. Area 12, Crew Leadership.

4.3.12.1. Q. Crew Chief accomplished the following throughout mission:

4.3.12.1.1. Ensured assigned crew are on time to check-in, brief, execute, and debrief.

4.3.12.1.2. Assesses assigned crew Operational Risk Management (ORM), Go/No-Go, and tool access prior to execution.

4.3.12.1.3. Tracked progress of detection actions against list of impacted blue space hosts and IPs.

4.3.12.1.4. Tracked progress of mitigation actions against list of IOCs. Ensured all IOAs are identified and mitigation actions are tracked.

4.3.12.1.5. Ensured assigned crew is gainfully and equitably employed.

4.3.12.1.6. Adjusted detection, mitigation, and clearing actions as needed to accomplish mission.

4.3.12.1.7. Adjusted execution window as needed to accomplish mission.

4.3.12.1.8. Requested additional operators based on task load and desired timeliness.

4.3.12.1.9. Requested mission cancellation or re-scheduling due to unforeseen circumstances.

4.3.12.1.10. Enforced professionalism of assigned crew.

4.3.12.2. Q-. Crew Chief's performance included errors or omissions that did not jeopardize mission accomplishment.

4.3.12.3. U. Crew Chief failed to provide adequate technical and/or tactical leadership. Crew Chief jeopardized mission accomplishment.

4.3.13. Area 13, Mission Reporting.

4.3.13.1. Q. Operator recognized all situations meeting reporting criteria. When required, operator provided timely, accurate, correctly formatted reports and communicated with external agencies and/or mission partners. Concise and accurate information was passed using proper medium, terminology, format and/or brevity. Sound understanding and use of crew position-relevant voice, email, chat, and collaborative tools were utilized to communicate mission essential information.

4.3.13.2. Q-. Minor errors, deviations, omissions, or latency were present on required reports. Omissions found in communications with external agencies and/or mission partners did not detract from overall mission accomplishment. Operator demonstrated limited understanding and use of crew position-relevant voice, email, chat, and collaborative tools.

4.3.13.3. U. Operator failed to recognize situations meeting reporting criteria and/or failure to report events essential to mission accomplishment. Severe breakdowns in communication with external agencies and/or mission partners precluded possible mission ineffectiveness and/or failure or jeopardized safety of others. Unclear or inaccurate information passed or improper or inadequate use of medium, terminology, format, and/or brevity put mission accomplishment at risk.

4.3.14. Area 14, Safety.

4.3.14.1. Q. Operator demonstrated awareness of and complied with all factors required for safe operations and mission accomplishment.

4.3.14.2. U. Operator was not aware of safety factors or disregarded procedures to safely operate and conduct the mission. Operator conducted unsafe actions that jeopardized mission accomplishment and/or put crewmembers at risk of injury or death. Operator performed in a manner that could or did result in damage or degradation to the WS/equipment.

4.3.15. Area 15, Crew Discipline.

4.3.15.1. Q. Operator demonstrated strict professional crew discipline throughout all phases of the mission. Operator planned, briefed, executed, and debriefed mission IAW applicable instructions and directives.

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

4.4. Instructor Observations Grading Criteria.

4.4.1. Prior to an initial Instructor observation, Instructor examinees must have completed all requisites for Instructor upgrade consideration, nomination, and training IAW DAFGM 2025-13-01V1, CFCMAN 13-602DCO-SV1 and all applicable guidance. **(T-2)**

4.4.2. Initial Instructor observations will be conducted with a trainee occupying the applicable spacecrew position whenever possible. **(T-2)** Instructor observations will be conducted with the Evaluator role playing as the trainee. **(T-2)**

4.4.3. The instructor examinee will monitor all phases of the mission and be prepared to demonstrate or explain any area or procedure. **(T-2)** The Evaluator will note the instructor's ability to recognize trainee difficulties and provide effective, timely instruction and/or corrective action. **(T-2)** The Evaluator will also evaluate the grade assigned and the completed grade sheet or event training form for the trainee on all initial instructor checks. **(T-2)**

4.4.4. The trainee performs duties prescribed by the instructor for the mission being accomplished. If an actual trainee is not available, the Evaluator will identify to the examinee (prior to the mission) the level of performance to be expected from the Evaluator acting as the trainee. **(T-2)** If this option is utilized, at least one event or briefing must be instructed. **(T-2)**

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

4.4.6. Earning a U in any of the Instructor Grading Criteria areas will result in a Q3 for the overall instructor grade. **(T-2)** The overall grade for the instructor portion of the evaluation will be no higher than the lowest overall grade awarded under QUAL. **(T-2)**

4.4.7. All Instructor Evaluation Criteria must be observed and graded to ensure a complete evaluation. **(T-2)** The following general evaluation grading criteria are common to all crew positions and will be used for all applicable instructor evaluations. **(T-2)**

4.4.7.1. Area A, Instructional Ability.

4.4.7.1.1. Q. Instructor demonstrated ability to communicate effectively. Instructor provided appropriate corrective guidance when necessary. Instructor planned ahead and made timely decisions. Instructor correctly analyzed errors.

4.4.7.1.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies were observed in the Q criteria above that did not adversely impact trainee progress.

4.4.7.1.3. U. Instructor was unable to effectively communicate with the trainee. Instructor did not provide corrective action where necessary. Instructor did not plan ahead or identify/respond to trainee difficulties. Instructor incorrectly analyzed trainee errors. Instructor adversely impacted trainee progress.

4.4.7.2. Area B, Classroom Utilization and Presentation.

4.4.7.2.1. Q. Instructor effectively utilized the classroom environment to supplement training. Instructor prepositioned and adequately postured the classroom and training materials and equipment for proper instruction. Instructor effectively incorporated visual aids and training materials into the lesson. Instructor demonstrated successful mannerisms to avoid distractions during instruction.

4.4.7.2.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies were observed in the Q criteria above that did not adversely impact trainee progress.

4.4.7.2.3. U. Instructor's classroom utilization and presentation were marginal or nonexistent. Instructor did not adequately posture the classroom and training materials and equipment for proper instruction. Instructor did not effectively incorporate visual aids and training materials into the lesson. Instructor failed to demonstrate appropriate mannerisms.

4.4.7.3. Area C, Demonstration and Performance.

4.4.7.3.1. Q. Instructor effectively demonstrated procedures and techniques. Instructor demonstrated thorough knowledge of WS components, procedures, and all applicable publications and regulations.

4.4.7.3.2. Q-. Minor discrepancies were observed in the Q criteria above that did not adversely impact trainee progress.

4.4.7.3.3. U. Instructor did not demonstrate correct procedure or technique. Instructor demonstrated insufficient depth of knowledge about WS components, procedures, or proper source material. Instructor adversely impacted trainee progress.

4.4.8. Instructor Observations will be documented in PEX and maintained in the member's crew qualification folder. **(T-2)**

4.5. Evaluator Observation and Grading Criteria. All Evaluator Observation Criteria must be observed and graded to ensure a complete observation. **(T-2)** A grade of U in any area for the Evaluator Observation may result in a restriction or removal of evaluator certification. Cumulative deviations will be considered when determining the overall rating. **(T-2)** Specific requirements for each observation are depicted in the following areas. The following grading criteria will be used by Evaluators when conducting Evaluator Observations: **(T-2)**

4.5.1. Area A, Compliance with Stan/Eval Directives.

4.5.1.1. Q. Evaluator complied with all directives pertaining to the administration of the evaluation.

4.5.1.2. Q-. Evaluator complied with most directives. Deviations observed did not jeopardize the effectiveness of the evaluation or mission success/safety.

4.5.1.3. U. Evaluator failed to comply with directives or allowed mission success and/or safety to be jeopardized.

4.5.2. Area B, Stan/Eval Briefing.

4.5.2.1. Q. Evaluator thoroughly briefed the evaluatee on the conduct of the evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, grading criteria, and evaluator actions/position during the eval.

4.5.2.2. Q-. Items were omitted during the briefing causing minor confusion. Evaluator did not fully brief the evaluatee as to the conduct and purpose of the evaluation.

4.5.2.3. U. Evaluator failed to adequately brief the evaluatee.

4.5.3. Area C, Performance Assessment and Grading.

4.5.3.1. Q. Evaluator identified all discrepancies and assigned proper area grade.

4.5.3.2. Q-. Most discrepancies were identified. Evaluator failed to assign Q- grade when appropriate. Evaluator assigned discrepancies for performance which was within standards.

4.5.3.3. U. Evaluator failed to identify discrepancies related to mission discipline or deviations which merited an unqualified grade. Evaluator assigned Q- grades that would have been U or assigned U grades for performance within standards.

4.5.4. Area D, Assessment of Overall Performance.

4.5.4.1. Q. Evaluator awarded the appropriate overall grade based on the examinee's performance. Evaluator assigned proper additional training if warranted and briefed the individual's training officer.

4.5.4.2. Q-. Evaluator awarded an overall grade without consideration of cumulative deviations in the examinee's performance. Additional training assigned was insufficient to ensure the examinee would achieve proper level of qualification.

4.5.4.3. U. Evaluator did not award a grade commensurate with overall performance. Evaluator failed to assign additional training when warranted and/or failed to brief the individual's training officer.

4.5.5. Area E, Mission Critique.

4.5.5.1. Q. Evaluator thoroughly debriefed the examinee and supervisor on all aspects of the evaluation. Evaluator debriefed all key mission events, providing instruction and references as required.

4.5.5.2. Q-. Evaluator failed to discuss all deviations and assigned grades. Evaluator did not advise the examinee of additional training, if required. Evaluator failed to debrief or adequately reconstruct all key mission events.

4.5.5.3. U. Evaluator did not discuss any assigned area grades or the overall rating. Evaluator changed grades without briefing the examinee. Evaluator did not debrief any portion of the mission. Evaluator debriefed few or no key mission events.

Chapter 5

DOCUMENTATION

5.1. Scope. Employment of the spacecrew qualification and certification program requires accurate and standardized documentation. The qualifications on which a spacecrew member is evaluated are determined from the BMQ MTL.

5.1.1. Record results of spacecrew evaluations, qualifications, and certifications on approved forms.

5.1.2. The following AF forms are maintained in PEX and are transferred with the spacecrew member to all subsequent duty assignments:

5.1.2.1. AF Form 8.

5.1.2.2. *Record of Training* in PEX.

5.1.2.3. *Individual's Record of Duty and Qualifications* in PEX.

5.2. Qualifications versus Certifications. Qualifications are attained through evaluations. Certifications are attained through methods other than evaluation (e.g., CC certifications, some upgrades) and will be documented on a unit certification document signed by a SQ/CC as the certifying official. **(T-2)**

5.3. Patriot Excalibur (PEX). PEX contains the source documents and Memorandums for Record (MFRs) constituting the history and qualification for each member.

5.3.1. Evaluation records will be maintained in PEX and are authorized provided proper security measures, backup capability, and sustainment plans are in place. **(T-2)**

5.3.2. Maintaining Individual Qualification Folders (IQF). SQ/CCs will ensure each member who is BMQ or CMR has an IQF. SQ/CCs can delegate IQF responsibilities. **(T-2)**

5.3.3. PEX will contain a complete record of the spacecrew member's evaluation history across their entire career. **(T-2)**

5.3.4. SQ/CCs will establish procedures to maintain and review unit IQFs and applicable forms. **(T-2)**

CHANDLER P. ATWOOD
Brigadier General, USSF
Deputy Commander

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

AFI 13-602V2, *Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*, 11 October 2019

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

CFCMAN 13-602DCO-SV1, *Defensive Cyberspace Operations for Space (DCO-S) – Training*, 22 December 2025

CFCMAN 13-602DCO-SV3, *Defensive Cyberspace Operations for Space (DCO-S) – Operating Procedures*, 22 December 2025

DAFGM 2025-13-01V1, *Ready Spacecrew Program Training*, 8 August 2025

DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, 18 October 2023

SpOC/CC Memo, *Delegations and Withholding of Authorities*, 23 October 2024

TO 00-5-1, *AF Technical Order System*, 19 November 2024

Prescribed Forms

None

Adopted Forms

AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*

DAF Form 679, *Department of the Air Force Publication Compliance Item Waiver Request/Approval*

DAF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Product*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACAD—Academic

AFI—Air Force Instruction

BMQ—Basic Mission Qualified

CC—Commander

CCDR—Combatant Commander

CCMD—Combatant Command

CD—Deputy Commander

CDO—Cyber Defense Operator

CFC—Combat Forces Command

CFCMAN—Combat Forces Command Manual

CIF—Crew Information File

CMR—Combat Mission Ready
COMSPACEFOR—Commander of Space Forces
CRV—Crew Readiness Verifications
CSTO—Combined Space Tasking Order
CT—Combat Training
CTE—Cyber Threat Emulation
CTM—Combat Training Mission
CTO—Cyber Tasking Order
CYS—Cyberspace Squadron
CW—Cyberspace Warfare
D&CI—Discover and Counter Infiltration
DAF—Department of the Air Force
DAFGM—Department of the Air Force Guidance Memorandum
DAFMAN—Department of the Air Force Manual
DCO-S—Defensive Cyberspace Operations for Space
DCW—Defensive Cyberspace Warfare
DEL—Delta
DEPORD—Deployment Order
Det—Detachment
DO—Director of Operations
DoD—Department of Defense
ECC—Evaluator Certification Course
eCOA—Enemy Course of Action
EXORD—Execution Order
EXP—Experienced
FLDCOM—Field Command
GM—Guidance Memorandum
HQ—Headquarters
IAW—In Accordance With
IOA—Indicators of Attack
IOC—Indicators of Compromise
IP—Internet Protocol

IQF—Individual Qualification Folder
IR—Incident Responder
MD—Mission Delta
MFR—Memorandum for Record
MOE—Measures of Effectiveness
MOP—Measures of Performance
MPC—Mission Planning Cell
MRT-C—Mission Relevant Terrain – Cyber
MSC—Mission Support Cell
MTL—Master Task List
N-CMR—Non-Combat Mission Ready
OCR—Office of Coordinating Responsibility
OPORD—Operations Order
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
ORM—Operational Risk Management
PBED—Plan, Brief, Execute, Debrief
PEX—Patriot Excalibur
PLANORD—Planning Order
ProVal—Proficiency Evaluation
Q—Qualified—Q—Qualified-minus
Q3—Qualification Level 3
QT—Qualification Training
QUAL—Qualification
RqT—Requalification Training
RSP—Ready Spacecrew Program
RT—Recurring Training
RTM—RSP Tasking Memorandum
SAV—Staff Assistance Visit
SBD—Space Base Delta
SEB—Standardization and Evaluation Board
SLD—Space Launch Delta
SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer

SPAFORGEN—Space Force Generation

SPFGM—Space Force Guidance Memorandum

SPINS—Special Instructions

SQ—Squadron

Stan/Eval—Standardization and Evaluation

SUPP—Supplemental

TO—Technical Order

TTP—Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures

U—Unqualified—USAF—United States Air Force

USSF—United States Space Force

UT—Upgrade Training

WS—Weapon System

Office Symbols

CFC/S35C—Combat Forces Command Cyber Warfare Division

CFC/S73—Combat Forces Command Training and Readiness

CFC/S735T—Combat Forces Command Training Branch