

**BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE**

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 20-111



1 JULY 2009

**AIR NATIONAL GUARD
Supplement**

3 JUNE 2010

Logistics

**LOGISTICS COMPLIANCE
ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (LCAP)**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing website at <http://www.e-publishing.af.mil> for downloading or ordering.

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: HQ USAF/A4LM

Certified by: HQ USAF/A4L
(Maj Gen Robert McMahon)

Pages: 30

(ANG)

OPR: NGB-A4Q

Certified by: ANGR/CC
(Col. Michael J. McDonald)

Pages:5

This publication implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 20-1, *Acquisition and Sustainment Life Cycle Management*. This instruction is the basic publication for implementing the Logistics Compliance Assessment Program (LCAP) across the logistics enterprise. It prescribes basic logistics assessment policy and procedures to be used throughout the USAF logistics community, and provides senior leadership and management direction for standardizing and verifying the accomplishment of the mission in accordance with DoD policy. The LCAP articulated herein supersedes previously separate Major Command (MAJCOM) Logistics Standardization and Evaluation Programs (LSEP) and Maintenance Standardization and Evaluation Programs (MSEP). It applies to all MAJCOMs, including the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) and the Air National Guard (ANG), along with their subordinates. For assistance with interpreting this instruction, contact your MAJCOM functional policy activity. Waiver authority for this instruction is HQ USAF/A4LM. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using AF IMT 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*; route AF IMT 847s from the field through the appropriate functional's chain of command. MAJCOMs supplementing this instruction must coordinate their supplements with HQ USAF/A4LM and will follow guidance in Air Force

Instruction (AFI) 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*. “Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af61a/afrims/afrims/rims.cfm>

This is an entirely new publication compiled principally from procedures found in MAJCOM LSEP/MSEP guidance. It significantly expands program applicability to include all logistics functions and disciplines. This AFI establishes the standardized basic requirements for Wing, Center, MAJCOM, and AF-level evaluations and reporting processes.

(ANG) This supplement implements and extends the guidance of Air Force Instruction (AFI) 20-111, Logistics Compliance Assessment Program (LCAP), 01 July 2009. This supplement describes Air National Guard (ANG) procedures to be used in conjunction with the basic instruction. This supplement applies to ANG, Active Associate and Air Reserve Component Associate units during non-federalized periods regardless of AFSC and is applicable during all technician and military duty periods. This supplement does not apply to ANG Classic Associate units. This instruction recognizes that command authority is exercised by the State Adjutants General. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af61a/afrims/afrims>. 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 847s from the field through the appropriate functional’s chain of command.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

(ANG) This is an entirely new publication that extends the guidance contained in AFI 20-111, Logistics Compliance Assessment Program (LCAP). It specifies how numerous functions of LCAP evaluations are performed within the various logistics activities in the ANG.

Chapter 1—GENERAL PURPOSE AND SCOPE	4
1.1. Purpose.	4
1.2. Scope.	4
1.2. (ANG) Scope.	4
1.3. Logistics Activities.	5
Chapter 2—RESPONSIBILITIES	8
2.1. Air Staff (AF/A4L) will.	8
2.2. Lead Major Command (MAJCOM) A4 will.	8
2.3. Component Major Command (C-MAJCOM) A4s will.	10
2.4. Evaluated Units will.	10

Chapter 3—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS AND METHODOLOGY	12
3.1. Evaluated Units.	12
3.2. Evaluation Notification.	12
3.3. Evaluation Frequency.	12
3.4. Evaluation Focus Areas.	12
3.5. LCAP Methodology.	13
3.6. Findings.	15
3.7. LCAP Checklists.	15
3.8. Acceptable Quality Levels (AQL).	15
3.9. LCAP Grading.	15
Table 3.1. Grading Scale.	16
3.10. LCAP Scoring.	16
Chapter 4—LCAP REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	17
4.1. Quarterly LCAP Status Report.	17
4.2. LCAP Unit Report.	17
4.3. LCAP Out Brief.	17
4.4. LCAP Finding Response Form.	18
4.5. LCAP Report Handling.	18
4.6. Prescribed and Adopted Forms.	19
Attachment 1—LEAD MAJCOM DESIGNATIONS	20
Attachment 2—LCAP UNIT REPORT FORMAT	21
Attachment 3—EVALUATION PROCEDURES	23
Attachment 4—LCAP SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE	29
Attachment 5—(Added-ANG) GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION	30

Chapter 1

GENERAL PURPOSE AND SCOPE

1.1. Purpose. The purpose of the Logistics Compliance Assessment Program (LCAP) is to provide leadership at all levels with an evaluation of a unit's ability to perform key logistics processes in a safe, standardized, repeatable, and technically compliant manner. Major Commands (MAJCOM) will conduct LCAP evaluations at subordinate units to assess their proficiency in key logistics processes. This AFI standardizes the LCAP breadth, depth, frequency, grading, and reporting requirements. The LCAP is focused on evaluating the effectiveness of personnel and logistics processes. The LCAP will:

1.1.1. Evaluate units across the entire logistics enterprise to a common Air Force standard.

1.1.2. Establish oversight, evaluation, and internal audit processes to effectively identify, prevent, and resolve deficiencies. It will also identify issues which are beyond the unit's control that require headquarter's resolution.

1.1.3. Establish a robust trend review, comprehensive causal analysis, and open sharing of lessons learned across all units.

1.1.4. Establish standard AF functional checklists across the logistics enterprise focused on personnel proficiency and process effectiveness.

1.2. Scope. The LCAP applies to AF units performing duties across the full spectrum of logistics. This includes conventional force logistics units; nuclear and nuclear support units; space; special operations; wholesale-level procurement, sustainment, and maintenance; logistics support to research, test, and development units; and logistics support to special access programs. It does not include medical logistics, civil engineering logistics, and pre-award contracting functions.

1.2. (ANG)Scope. Standard and non-standard ANG logistics units will be evaluated in accordance with this instruction. Typical non-standard ANG logistics units include but are not limited to: Air National Guard / Air Force Reserve Test Center (AATC), Alert Detachments (AD), Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities (CIRF), Combat Readiness Training Centers (CRTC), Forward Operating Locations (FOL), Geographically Separated Units (GSU), Intelligence Wings (IW), Reconnaissance Wings (RWs), and Type II Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory (Type II PMEL).

1.2.1. The overlap in scope between LCAP evaluations and Inspector General (IG) Inspections (i.e., Unit Compliance Inspections (UCIs)) will be minimized to the maximum extent practical. LCAP evaluations focus heavily on personnel proficiency to verify compliance with established policy and procedures. However, it is possible to have some duplication especially in functional areas that are more process oriented versus task oriented.

1.2.1.1. When LCAP evaluations are conducted simultaneously with UCIs the LCAP evaluation will remain a separate entity. All provisions of this AFI shall apply.

1.2.1.1. (ANG) To the maximum extent possible, ANG LCAP evaluations and UCIs will be conducted simultaneously.

1.2.1.2. LCAP evaluations will not be conducted simultaneously with Nuclear Surety Inspections.

1.3. Logistics Activities. This instruction provides policy and establishes program requirements for logistics activities performing the following functions:

1.3.1. Supply Chain Management Functions. Consists of the end-to-end processes and functions of the logistics enterprise which include: Plan; Source; Make and Repair; and Deliver and Return.

1.3.1.1. **Plan.** Includes all organizations within the wholesale and base-level logistics enterprise that plan processes across the Air Force's sourcing; make and repair; and deliver and return functions.

1.3.1.2. **Source.** Includes all organizations within the wholesale and base-level logistics enterprise that perform the procurement of materiel, equipment, commodities, and services from external and internal suppliers, including commercial vendors and other Department of Defense sources. "Source" does not include pre-award and award contracting functions resident in base-level contracting squadrons or equivalent organizations.

1.3.1.3. **Make and Repair.** Includes all organizations within the wholesale and base-level logistics enterprise that conduct activities related to the manufacture and repair of assets to support weapon systems. This encompasses organizations that perform launch, recovery, ground handling, and servicing of aircraft. It includes organizations that perform manufacturing, maintenance, repair, calibration, overhaul, or inspection of: aircraft, aerospace equipment, aircraft engines, support equipment/tools, conventional munitions, nuclear munitions, missiles, vehicles, components, and other non-flying weapon systems.

1.3.1.4. **Deliver and Return.** Includes all organizations within the wholesale and base-level logistics enterprise that process the receipt of orders; automatically source orders within the supply chain; and ship, track, and store all materiel, equipment, and commodities. This encompasses organizations that provide inventory management, distribution, and transportation activities for materiel, equipment, and commodities. It includes maintaining Positive Inventory Control (PIC) for all materiel to include nuclear weapons related materiel (NWRM), weapons, classified assets, Controlled Cryptographic Item (CCI) and Communication Security (COMSEC) equipment.

1.3.2. Enablers. Includes all organizations at the wing-level, or equivalent, and below within the wholesale and base-level logistics enterprise that provide support to supply chain management functions or conduct other logistics activities. Enabling functions include:

1.3.2.1. **Quality Assurance (QA) and Compliance Functions.** Includes all organizations within the wholesale and base-level logistics enterprise that verify logistics processes are conducted in a safe, standardized, repeatable, and technically compliant manner. This function verifies that processes and personnel are meeting or exceeding quality standards established by technical orders, instructions, manuals, or directives. It includes personnel performing a QA function on logistics contractor managed organizations.

1.3.2.2. Deployment Planning/Execution and Base Support/Expeditionary Site Planning Functions. Includes logistics activities responsible for the command, control, planning, and execution of unit deployment and redeployment operations in a contingency and steady-state environment. It also includes base support, expeditionary site planning, and the war reserve materiel program.

1.3.2.3. Personnel Support and Training Functions. Includes all organizations within the logistics enterprise responsible for direct logistics support of unit personnel. Functions include:

1.3.2.3.1. The movement of personnel in support of daily and contingency operations.

1.3.2.3.2. Administration and execution of the personal property movement program at the unit-level and Air Force-managed Joint Personal Property Shipping Offices.

1.3.2.3.3. Training of logistics personnel to perform their assigned duties in a safe, standardized, repeatable, and technically compliant manner.

1.3.3. Contractor Managed Organizations. Contracted units performing the logistics functions described in **paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3** present unique challenges for conducting LCAP evaluations. The following procedures will be followed for Contractor Managed Organizations:

1.3.3.1. If the provisions of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) or Performance Plan (P-Plan) allow for higher headquarters direct evaluation (i.e., on-site observation by evaluators) of the contracted organization, then the LCAP evaluation shall be conducted in conjunction with the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) in accordance with the guidance contained in this instruction and governing Quality Assurance directives. **NOTE:** For the purpose of this instruction, COR is synonymous with Quality Assurance Evaluator (QAE) and Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR).

1.3.3.1. (ANG) For the purpose of this instruction, COR is also synonymous with Quality Assurance Representative (QAR).

1.3.3.1.1. LCAP evaluators conducting direct evaluation of the contracted organization must be properly trained in QAE functions and must coordinate closely with the COR on all aspects of the evaluation.

1.3.3.2. If direct evaluation of the contractor managed organization is not permitted by the PWS or P- Plan, then follow the below guidance.

1.3.3.2.1. Evaluate the contractor's performance by conducting a joint surveillance with the COR and/or examining the COR documentation as compared to the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) or P-Plan for that contract.

1.3.3.2.2. Evaluate that the COR is providing effective oversight of the contract by ensuring that the QASP or P-Plan is being followed as written, that the multifunctional team periodically reviews the plan and initiates modifications to the plan when needed, and that it adheres to applicable governing directives.

1.3.3.2.3. Evaluate the PWS requirements and service summary objectives against the organizational objectives to ensure they are adequately written to satisfy mission requirements.

1.3.3.2.4. Ensure the Contracting Officer and COR review findings associated with contractor performance prior to inclusion in the LCAP Unit Report. **NOTE:** Only the Contracting Officer can take formal action against the contractor for non-compliance or direct contractors to correct deficiencies identified during evaluations.

Chapter 2

RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Air Staff (AF/A4L) will.

- 2.1.1. Develop, articulate, and clarify all Air Force LCAP policies.
- 2.1.2. Develop and publish functional LCAP checklists in coordination with Lead Major Commands.
- 2.1.3. Develop and publish the MAJCOM quarterly report format.
- 2.1.4. Review quarterly reports for trends and effectiveness of program.
- 2.1.5. Provide a quarterly summary of Air Force-wide LCAP results to CSAF/SECAF and MAJCOMs.
- 2.1.6. Develop a method to share trends and critical LCAP information across the AF logistics community.

2.2. Lead Major Command (MAJCOM) A4 will.

- 2.2.1. Administer, manage, plan, and execute all aspects of the LCAP for their MAJCOM/CC and Component Major Command (C-MAJCOM) supported units in coordination with the C-MAJCOM to ensure program standardization. Refer to [Attachment 1](#) for a listing of Lead and C-MAJCOMs.
- 2.2.2. Provide input to AF/A4L on standardized functional LCAP checklists in coordination with C-MAJCOMs.
- 2.2.3. Supplement this publication and the LCAP checklists as required for unique mission requirements in coordination with C-MAJCOMs and AF/A4L.
- 2.2.4. Compile and forward quarterly LCAP results to AF/A4L in coordination with C-MAJCOMs. Refer to [Chapter 4](#) for additional guidance on reporting requirements.
- 2.2.5. Designate an A4 office to serve as the office of primary responsibility (OPR) to liaison between AF/A4L, C-MAJCOMs, and evaluated units.
- 2.2.5. (ANG) The designated office to serve as the OPR for the ANG is NGB/A4Q. This office is located within the Inspections Division of the Logistics Directorate of the Air Directorate of the National Guard Bureau and is responsible for all facets of administering the LCAP for the ANG in accordance with this and other applicable directives.
- 2.2.6. Conduct LCAP evaluations following the frequency interval defined in [paragraph 3.3](#). Refer to [Attachment 1](#) for additional guidance on unique situations such as combined Combat Air Forces (CAF) and Mobility Air Forces (MAF) evaluations.
- 2.2.7. Coordinate LCAP evaluations with the respective MAJCOM IG Gatekeeper. If the LCAP evaluation is synchronized with an IG inspection, ensure the IG Trusted Agent system is honored to protect the minimal or no-notice intent of the programs.
- 2.2.7. (ANG) NGB/A4Q will be the Directorate's central Point of Contact (POC) for IG Inspection Reports and will provide the NGB/A4 staff with pertinent details concerning units

with upcoming IG Inspections. NGB/A4Q will also act as Directorate “Gatekeeper” for IG Results and Upcoming IG Inspections. Additionally, NGB/A4Q will ensure effective dissemination and analysis of IG results in the ANG maintenance and logistics communities, review, and provide summaries of all IG results affecting ANG maintenance and logistics.

2.2.8. Organize a Logistics Compliance Assessment Team (LCAT) composed of sufficient personnel and subject matter experts to assess the ability of logistics units to perform processes in a safe, standardized, repeatable, and technically compliant manner. MAJCOMs may elect to form a permanent standing LCAT or organize them on a temporary basis to conduct evaluations.

2.2.8. (ANG) Inspection Team Augmentation. NGB/A4Q/A4M/A4R, and units will provide qualified personnel to augment ANG LCAP inspections. Unit aircraft maintenance augmentees will be trained on inspection and evaluation techniques to include receiving an Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPE) by their home unit Quality Assurance office prior to LCAP augmentation. Logistics Readiness Squadron (LRS) evaluators will be approved by NGB/A4R. NGB/A4Q will provide Bureau Directed Travel (BDT) to units providing augmentees in support of the LCAP program. Upon completion of a TDY, members must complete a travel voucher and inform their respective financial manager to enter the actual costs into the LG Total Travel Program (LGTTP) and update the information as it pertains to the BDT control number identified for this individual. Then mark it complete and electronically attach a copy of the submitted voucher within five working days after completion of travel to ensure reimbursement. Once reimbursement occurs, the member must submit the paid voucher to LGTTP within five working days. Note: Any outstanding BDT reimbursements not requested by the unit within ninety days will be cancelled

2.2.8.1. Coordinate with other Lead MAJCOMs and C-MAJCOMs, when applicable, on the composition of LCATs to include temporary augmentation requirements.

2.2.8.2. Coordinate with the Air National Guard on the augmentation of LCATs as necessary to achieve the standard LCAP frequency for ANG units defined in paragraph 3.3.

2.2.8.2. (ANG) The coordinating office for the ANG is NGB/A4Q.

2.2.8.3. (Added-ANG) ANG will conduct an observer program, its goal being to assist units in designing effective management control and self-inspection programs to improve compliance and readiness.

2.2.8.3.1. (Added-ANG) Requests to observe will be prioritized based on factors such as projected inspection dates and date of request. Individual wings may request a maximum of two observers to any given inspection however the maximum total number from all Wings on any inspection will be six. Not later than 30 days prior to the inspection, NGB/A4Q will make the final determination of which observers have been approved. All units who have requested observers will be notified of their status.

2.2.8.3.2. (Added-ANG) To observe an ANG LCAP, units will submit a request to the ANG LCAP organizational e-mail box ngb.a4q@ang.af.mil.

2.2.8.3.3. (Added-ANG) Observers are required to fund and arrange for their own travel, billeting, and ground transportation.

2.2.8.3.4. (**Added-ANG**) Observers will attend the LCAP in-brief. Prior to observation, observers will meet with the Team Chief for a briefing on their responsibilities and limitations. The Team Chief will issue each observer an observer badge which the observer must wear throughout the inspection. Observers must not interfere in any way with the operations of the inspected unit or the LCAP team. Observers may not be permitted to attend LCAP team meetings where sensitive unit personnel issues are discussed.

2.2.9. Provide an LCAP report for evaluated units using the template illustrated in **Attachment 2**. Coordinate with C-MAJCOMs when applicable. Refer to **Chapter 4** for additional guidance on reporting requirements.

2.2.10. Track major findings through closure and approve/disapprove unit recommendations for closing major findings for evaluated units using AF Form 4395, *LCAP Finding Response*. Coordinate with C-MAJCOMs when applicable.

2.3. Component Major Command (C-MAJCOM) A4s will.

2.3.1. Coordinate with the Lead MAJCOM(s) to ensure evaluation standardization for their MAJCOM/CC. Refer to **Attachment 1** for a listing of Lead and C-MAJCOMs.

2.3.2. Provide input to the Lead MAJCOM(s) on the development of standardized functional LCAP checklists.

2.3.3. Provide inputs to the Lead MAJCOM(s) to supplement this publication and the functional LCAP checklists.

2.3.4. Consolidate and report quarterly LCAP results to the Lead MAJCOM(s) using the AF-developed format. Refer to **Chapter 4** for additional guidance on reporting requirements.

2.3.5. Designate an A4 office to serve as the office of primary responsibility (OPR) to liaison between the Lead MAJCOM(s) and evaluated units.

2.3.6. Coordinate with the Lead MAJCOM on the establishment and staffing of the LCAT based on the size, mission, and structure of the subordinate units being evaluated.

2.3.7. Coordinate with the Lead MAJCOM for LCAP evaluations on subordinate units following the frequency interval defined in **paragraph 3.3**. Refer to **Attachment 1** for additional guidance on unique situations such as combined CAF/MAF evaluations.

2.3.8. In conjunction with the Lead MAJCOM, provide an LCAP report to evaluated subordinate units using the template illustrated in **Attachment 2**. Refer to **Chapter 4** for additional guidance on reporting requirements.

2.3.9. Track major findings through closure and approve/disapprove unit recommendations for closing major findings for evaluated units using AF Form 4395, *LCAP Finding Response*. Provide status to the Lead MAJCOM(s).

2.4. Evaluated Units will.

2.4.1. Identify a Primary and Alternate LCAP Unit Coordinator to the MAJCOM LCAP OPR. The LCAP Unit Coordinator will be the focal point for all LCAP issues and coordinate LCAT visits.

2.4.2. Provide required support to the LCAT as identified by the MAJCOM conducting the evaluation. Support requirements include, but are not limited to, arranging for: billeting, work centers, computer workstations, transportation, identifying security requirements for base and LAN access, and an in/out brief location.

2.4.2. (ANG) Evaluated unit will provide adequate wing-level facilities for briefings/meetings to include: in/out briefing; daily validation meeting; daily hot wash.

2.4.3. Report the status and corrective actions for all unresolved major findings resulting from LCAP evaluations to the MAJCOM LCAP OPR using AF Form 4395, *LCAP Finding Response*. Refer to **Chapter 4** for additional guidance on unit LCAP reporting requirements.

2.4.3. (ANG) Wing Commander, or designated representative, will forward status and corrective action report to the ANG LCAP organizational box, ngb.a4q@ang.af.mil.

2.4.3.1. (Added-ANG) Alert Detachments and GSUs will forward status and corrective action report through their parent group/wing and to the ANG LCAP organizational box, ngb.a4q@ang.af.mil.

2.4.4. (Added-ANG) Mission Support Group (MSG) and Maintenance Group (MXG) commanders will ensure that day-to-day operations are not affected by an LCAP inspection.

2.4.5. (Added-ANG) Units will align their Unit Training Assembly (UTA) and Air Technician work week schedules to coincide with the LCAP scheduled evaluation.

2.4.6. (Added-ANG) Unit deliverables must be loaded to the ANG LCAP Community of Practice (CoP) NLT 30 days from the inspection start date.

Chapter 3

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Evaluated Units. LCAP evaluations will be conducted on logistics activities performing functions described in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3.

3.2. Evaluation Notification. LCAP evaluations will be conducted on a minimal notice basis. The LCAP Unit Coordinator will be notified prior to the start of an evaluation no earlier than:

3.2.1. Active Duty (AD) Units: Forty-five (45) calendar days.

3.2.2. Air Reserve Component (ARC) Units: One-hundred and eighty (180) calendar days.

3.2.3. Associate Units (Classic, Active, or ARC associate units): Follow the notification rule of the host unit.

3.3. Evaluation Frequency. LCAP evaluations will be conducted on a recurring cycle based on the type of unit being evaluated. LCAP evaluation intervals are:

3.3.1. AD Units: Not to exceed 24 months.

3.3.2. Nuclear Capable and Nuclear Support Units: Not to exceed 18 months. **NOTE:** Nuclear Support Units include the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, Air Force Global Logistics Support Center, and Air Logistics Centers providing direct support to nuclear capable units or weapon systems.

3.3.3. ARC Units: Not to exceed 48 months. **NOTE:** The 48-month frequency is the standard for Air National Guard units given augmentation by the Lead Commands as described in paragraph 2.2.8.2. The Director, ANG, may extend the frequency to a maximum of 60 months on a case-by-case basis for special circumstances, including lead command or ANG resource limitations that prevent assembling a sufficient LCAP team. Approval authority cannot be delegated.

3.3.3. (ANG) Wing Commanders will submit change requests to NGB/A4Q, who will staff the request to the Director, ANG. The NGB/A4Q will then submit the request with a recommendation to the NGB/A4.

3.3.4. Associate Units (Classic, Active, or ARC associate units): Follow the frequency interval of the host unit.

3.3.5. Follow-up Evaluations. Logistics activities or focus areas rated “Marginal” or “Unsatisfactory” will have a follow-up evaluation within 180 days of the conclusion of the initial LCAP evaluation. The follow-up evaluation team shall be tailored to properly re-assess the “Marginal” or “Unsatisfactory” activities/areas.

3.4. Evaluation Focus Areas. The below areas are used to group unit deficiencies in the LCAP Unit Report for focusing management attention where needed.

3.4.1. Compliance with Nuclear Surety Standards (if applicable). Personnel at all levels are responsible for ensuring nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon systems, and nuclear weapon related materiel are safe, secure, and reliable. Ensure weapon system safety rules, owner/user security, and reliability standards are strictly adhered.

3.4.2. Qualified and Proficient Workforce. Ensure a properly trained and qualified workforce is maintained to accomplish the mission. Commanders are responsible for ensuring unit personnel receive the proper training to accomplish the mission. Factors that impede the unit's ability to adequately achieve or maintain a qualified workforce should be identified to higher headquarters.

3.4.3. Compliance with Technical Orders (TO), Instructions, Manuals, and Directives. Personnel at all levels are responsible and accountable for enforcing mandatory standards. Ensure all applicable TOs, instructions, manuals, and directives are complete, current, and used. This includes ensuring required forms and records are properly completed and maintained in accordance with applicable directives for any logistics-related activity.

3.4.4. Compliance and Management of Safety Programs. Personnel at all levels are responsible for minimizing risk to equipment and personnel.

3.4.5. Facilities and Equipment Condition. Supervisors at all levels are required to ensure adequate facilities and equipment required to accomplish the mission are available and properly maintained. Commanders are responsible for identifying facility and equipment conditions and shortfalls that impact mission accomplishment to the appropriate agency/higher headquarters.

3.4.6. Asset Accountability. Personnel at all levels are responsible for ensuring the proper accountability of tools, materiel, equipment, and weapons. This includes ensuring Positive Inventory Control (PIC) of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon systems, Nuclear Weapons Related Materiel (NWRM), classified assets, CCI/COMSEC, equipment, serialized control items, small arms, conventional munitions, and sensitive related materiel. It includes ensuring that accurate logistics data is reflected for the materiel in appropriate functional information management systems.

3.5. LCAP Methodology. The LCAP will be conducted through the use of evaluations, inspections, and observations.

3.5.1. Evaluations. Represents the direct evaluation of a logistics action, inspection, or training conducted/performed by an individual or team. Evaluations are used to evaluate job proficiency, degree of training, and compliance with technical data or instructions. Any individual performing, supervising, or evaluating logistics tasks is subject to a direct evaluation. LCAT personnel performing evaluations must have sufficient subject matter expertise to properly and safely conduct the evaluation. Refer to **Attachment 3** for specific procedures on conducting and rating evaluations. Evaluations include:

3.5.1.1. Personnel Evaluations (PE). A PE is the direct evaluation of an individual or team conducting/performing a logistics action. PEs may be conducted on task-oriented functions such as equipment maintenance as well as process-oriented functions such as vehicle dispatch.

3.5.1.2. Evaluator Proficiency Evaluations (EPE). An EPE is the direct evaluation of a Quality Assurance (QA) individual or any individual performing a quality/compliance assurance function in a unit.

3.5.1.3. Trainer Proficiency Evaluations (TPE). A TPE is the direct evaluation of a unit instructor/trainer to determine their ability to teach accurately and sufficiently. TPEs

also assess weapon system, equipment or process knowledge; teaching methods and techniques; the ability to operate trainers; and adequacy and effectiveness of training programs. Any individual training personnel on a task or process is subject to a TPE.

3.5.1.4. **Trainer Maintenance Proficiency Evaluations (TMPE).** A TMPE is the direct evaluation of unit personnel who maintain nuclear weapon training systems/facilities to assess their ability to sustain the systems.

3.5.2. **Inspections.** Represents inspections of equipment and processes, often through the use of LCAP functional checklists, to ensure compliance with established standards. Inspections are rated as “Pass” or “Fail”.

3.5.2.1. **Quality Verification Inspection (QVI).** A QVI is an inspection of equipment condition or a process after an inspection, repair action, or process has been completed by a technician or supervisor to assess if it was properly completed. The QVI finding should reflect deficiencies by the individual who accomplished the task and identify specific discrepancies.

3.5.2.2. **Special Inspections (SI).** SIs are inspections not covered by QVIs or Evaluations and may include, but are not limited to, inspections of: aircraft and equipment forms, document control procedures and file plans, consolidated tool kits, inventory controls, TO files, vehicle inspections, housekeeping, safety practices, FOD program, and other interest items identified by Headquarters Air Force and Lead/C-MAJCOMs. SIs may be compliance or proficiency oriented.

3.5.3. **Observations.** Represents observed events or conditions with safety implications or technical violations not related to an evaluation or inspection that are considered unsafe, not in accordance with established procedures, or in the case of equipment, unfit to operate.

3.5.3.1. **Detected Safety Violation (DSV).** A DSV is an observed unsafe act by an individual. The LCAT evaluator must stop the unsafe act immediately. Do not document a separate DSV on an individual undergoing a direct evaluation since the unsafe act automatically results in a “Fail” rating. Annotate the failure with “Safety” when a safety violation is committed during an evaluation.

3.5.3.2. **Technical Data Violation (TDV).** A TDV is an observation of any person performing maintenance or another logistics process without the required technical data present at the job site and in use. The technician must have knowledge of all general directives associated with the job prior to performing the task. However, these directives do not need to be present at the job site. Do not document a separate TDV on an individual undergoing a direct evaluation since failure to use technical data automatically results in a “Fail” rating. Annotate the failure with “Tech Data” when a TDV is committed during an evaluation.

3.5.3.3. **Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR).** A UCR is an unsafe or unsatisfactory condition, other than a DSV, chargeable to the work center supervisor. UCRs will be documented even when it is not possible to determine who created the condition.

3.6. Findings. Findings are validated deficiencies and will be tracked at the appropriate level until resolved.

3.6.1. Major Finding. Any deficiency that results or could result in widespread or significant mission impact or failure. Major findings are tracked and closed out at the MAJCOM level.

3.6.2. Minor Finding. Any deficiency that is procedurally incorrect but only has minor mission impact. Minor findings are tracked and closed out at the installation level.

3.7. LCAP Checklists.

3.7.1. LCAP functional checklists are developed and published by AF/A4L in coordination with Lead MAJCOMs and posted on the AF Portal in the LCAP Community of Practice (CoP).

3.7.2. Checklists serve as a guide for evaluated units and are not all-inclusive nor do they limit the flexibility of LCAT evaluators to address other logistics processes in a unit.

3.7.3. Critical and Non-Critical Checklist Items. Checklist items will be identified as critical or non-critical depending on the process or task.

3.7.3.1. Definition of Critical: Items identified as key result areas for successful mission accomplishment including, but not limited to, items where non-compliance would affect system reliability or result in serious injury, loss of life, excessive cost, or litigation. Failure to comply with processes or tasks identified as critical could result in significant mission impact or failure. Failure to meet any “critical” checklist item will result in the task/process being rated “Fail”.

3.7.3.2. Definition of Non-Critical: Areas that require special vigilance and are important to the overall performance of the unit, but are not deemed "Critical." Non-compliance could result in some negative impact on mission performance or could result in injury, unnecessary cost, or possible litigation.

3.8. Acceptable Quality Levels (AQL). AQLs will be used to minimize subjectivity in the LCAP evaluation. An AQL denotes the maximum allowable number of “non-critical” checklist items or “minor” evaluation discrepancies that a task, process or product may receive and still be rated “Pass”.

3.8.1. Failure to meet an AQL standard will result in a task/process rating of “Fail”.

3.8.2. Checklist AQLs will be annotated on the individual checklist.

3.8.3. Evaluation AQLs are found in **Table A3.1**.

3.9. LCAP Grading. Consistent with LCAP’s purpose to evaluate a unit’s ability to perform key processes in a safe and compliant manner, units will receive an overall grade based on a five-tier grading scale.

3.9.1. Grades will be reported for the lowest reasonable level of an organization based on the scope of the evaluation. It shall also be accomplished across the evaluated unit’s chain of command up to the Wing-level or equivalent. Associate units will receive one grade and one unit report. The unit grade will be part of the LCAP Unit Report using the format in [Attachment 2](#).

3.9.2. The LCAT Team Chief will assign ratings that accurately reflect observed performance. The Team Chief will use the described scoring methodology as the starting point for determining unit grades. However, the grading criteria is designed as a guide and is not a substitute for the judgment of the Team Chief. When the Team Chief ratings differ from the established grading criteria, the rationale will be explained in the LCAP Unit Report.

3.9.3. The Five-Tier Grading Scale is:

Table 3.1. Grading Scale.

Outstanding	95 - 100%
Excellent	90 - 94.99%
Satisfactory	80 - 89.99%
Marginal	70 - 79.99%
Unsatisfactory	0 - 69.99%

3.10. LCAP Scoring. The overall score will be determined by calculating a baseline score and then deducting for penalties.

3.10.1. **Baseline Score.** The baseline score is calculated by dividing the total number of passed events by the total of all events. Events are defined as Evaluations ([paragraph 3.5.1](#)) and Inspections ([paragraph 3.5.2](#)). Do not include observations in the baseline score.

3.10.2. **Deductions.** Deductions are calculated by assessing a .5% penalty for each observation as defined in [paragraph 3.5.3](#) and repeat LCAP findings. A repeat finding is defined as any identified “Major” finding from the previous LCAP evaluation. Refer to [Attachment 4](#) for a score calculation example.

3.10.3. For nuclear units, each condition resulting in, or meeting the criteria for, an “Unreliable Nuclear Weapon”, “Unsafe Environment”, or “Insecure Environment” as defined in TO 11N-25-1, *Department of Defense Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspection System*, Section 3-2.2 will be treated as a .5% deduction as defined in [paragraph 3.10.2](#). Each of these conditions will be reported as a Major Finding as defined in [paragraph 3.6](#) and annotated with “UNACCEPTABLE CONDITION THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE ATTENTION.”

Chapter 4

LCAP REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

4.1. Quarterly LCAP Status Report. Lead MAJCOMs will submit a quarterly status report to AF/A4L using the Air Staff developed and published format.

4.1.1. The report will cover the previous quarter's completed LCAP activity as well as a projection for the current quarter. Specific suspense dates will be established by AF/A4L.

4.2. LCAP Unit Report. The LCAP Unit Report is a concise compilation of evaluation results provided to the evaluated unit and answerable to the parent MAJCOM A4. The report will be completed using a two-stage process.

4.2.1. An Initial Report will be provided to the evaluated unit prior to LCAT departure. LCATs will use the report format found at [Attachment 2](#); however, all findings and scores are preliminary until endorsed by the Lead MAJCOM A4 in coordination with the C-MAJCOM when applicable.

4.2.1.1. Units may submit rebuttals to findings in the Initial Report using AF Form 4395, *LCAP Finding Response*, no later than 7 days after the completion of the LCAP evaluation. Rebuttals must be submitted from the Group-level or equivalent to the MAJCOM LCAP OPR. Justification for rebuttal must be clearly stated and additional supporting documentation may be submitted. The Lead MAJCOM, in coordination with the C-MAJCOM when applicable, will approve or disapprove the rebuttal and, if warranted, adjust the unit grade.

4.2.1.1. (ANG) Submit rebuttals to the ANG LCAP organizational e-mail box ngb.a4q@ang.af.mil.

4.2.2. The Final Report will be provided by the Lead MAJCOM A4, through the C-MAJCOM, to the evaluated unit within 30 calendar days of the conclusion of the LCAP. The final report will contain the final determination of findings, unit score, and other information using the report format in [Attachment 2](#).

4.2.2. (ANG) Evaluation results will also be provided to NGB/A4 and also posted on the ANG LCAP CoP for cross-tell purposes.

4.2.3. Each finding (failed evaluations, inspections, and observations) will include the applicable reference(s).

4.3. LCAP Out Brief. The LCAT Team Chief will provide an out brief to the evaluated unit on the final day of the evaluation using the information contained in the initial report. All findings, grades, and conclusions are preliminary until release of the final report.

4.3.1. Attendees include, at a minimum, Key Unit Leadership and the LCAT Team Chief. Other interested parties may attend upon the mutual agreement of the LCAT Team Chief and the evaluated Wing Commander/Vice Commander or equivalent.

4.4. LCAP Finding Response Form. The evaluated unit must provide a written response to the MAJCOM LCAP OPR on all documented major findings within 30 days of receipt of the final LCAP Unit Report using AF Form 4395, *LCAP Finding Response*. **EXCEPTION:** ARC evaluated units must provide response within 60 days of receipt of the final LCAP Unit Report.

4.4.1. Major findings recommended for closure must include root cause analysis and sufficient corrective action measures to prevent reoccurrence. If the finding remains open, units must state the corrective action already taken, the plan for final resolution, and the estimated completion date.

4.4.1.1. Root cause analysis techniques may be found in the *Air Force Smart Operations for the 21st Century Playbook, Volume B (Ver 2.0): Introduction to the Eight Step OODA Loop AFSSO Problem Solving*, located on the Air Force Portal.

4.4.2. Units will submit responses every 30 days to the MAJCOM LCAP OPR with a cover letter signed by the Wing Commander or Vice Commander until all findings have been closed.

4.4.2.1. **(Added-ANG)** To request closure of major findings, the Wing Commander will send an electronic memo to the ANG LCAP organizational e-mail box ngb.a4q@ang.af.mil.

4.4.2.2. **(Added-ANG)** To request closure of major findings, the Alert Detachment and GSU Commanders will send an electronic memo through their parent group/wing and to the ANG LCAP organizational e-mail box ngb.a4q@ang.af.mil.

4.5. LCAP Report Handling.

4.5.1. Classification. The LCAP Report must be marked in accordance with the security classification guide. Mark unclassified reports as “For Official Use Only” (FOUO) if they contain FOUO information as defined in DOD 5400.7-R/AF Supplement, *DOD Freedom of Information Act Program* and DOD Regulation 5200.1-R, *DOD Information Security Program*. Mark reports containing classified information as prescribed by DOD Regulation 5200.1-R and AFI 31-401, *Information Security Program Management*.

4.5.2. Releasability. LCAP Reports are privileged documents and the Air Force controls their distribution. The following statement must appear on the cover and in the body of each report: “For Official Use Only. This report contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or in part to persons or agencies outside the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director of Logistics, AF/A4L .”

4.5.2.1. Final Reports may be released in whole or part within the DoD at MAJCOM A4 discretion. A summary of findings and facts may be released for inclusion in base and local newspapers. Do not release inter/intra-agency pre-decisional/deliberative material. Contact AF/A4L for approval to release reports in whole or in part outside the DoD.

4.5.2.2. All LCAP reports marked in accordance with [paragraph 4.5.1](#) will be maintained IAW the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS),

Records Disposition Schedule, Table 21-09 R 02.00, *Quality Control Inspection/Evaluation Records*, located on the AF Portal (<https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af61a/afrims/afrims/rims.cfm>). Records should be destroyed IAW DoD Regulation 5400.7-R for FOUO material and IAW AFI 31-401 for classified material.

4.5.2.3. The MAJCOM LCAP OPR will coordinate with the evaluated unit Contracting Officer Representative to identify any LCAP Unit Report releasability restrictions that may apply to Contractor Managed Operations.

4.5.3. Distribution. The LCAP Unit Reports will be posted on the AF Portal in the LCAP CoP to foster cross sharing of information. The MAJCOM and AF quarterly reports will also be posted on the LCAP CoP as well as functional LCAP checklists.

4.5.3. (ANG) ANG specific cross sharing information will be posted on the ANG LCAP CoP.

4.6. Prescribed and Adopted Forms.

AF Form 2419, *Routing and Review of Quality Control Reports*

AF Form 2420, *Quality Control Inspection Summary*

AF IMT 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AF Form 4385, *Logistics Compliance Assessment Program (LCAP) Finding Response*

AF Form 2435, *Load Training and Certification Document*

LOREN M. RENO, Lt Gen, USAF
DCS/Logistics, Installations & Mission Support

Attachment 1

LEAD MAJCOM DESIGNATIONS

A1.1. PURPOSE. This section provides a summary of Lead and Component MAJCOM designations as defined in AFPD 10-9, *Lead Command Designation and Responsibilities for Weapon Systems* and current Program Action Directives (PAD).

A1.1.1. Air Combat Command is the Lead MAJCOM for combat air forces (CAF).

A1.1.2. Air Education Training Command is the Lead MAJCOM for training.

A1.1.3. Air Force Materiel Command is the Lead MAJCOM for equipping.

A1.1.4. Air Force Reserve Command is the Lead MAJCOM for the Air Force Reserve.

A1.1.5. Air Force Special Operations Command is the Lead MAJCOM for special operations.

A1.1.6. Air Force Space Command is the Lead MAJCOM for space.

A1.1.7. Air Mobility Command is the Lead MAJCOM for mobility air forces (MAF).

A1.1.8. U.S. Pacific Air Forces is the Component MAJCOM for U.S. Pacific Command.

A1.1.9. U.S. Air Forces Europe is the Component MAJCOM for U.S. European Command.

A1.1.10. Air Force Global Strike Command will be the lead command for B-2 and B-52 aircraft, Air Launched Cruise Missiles, nuclear gravity munitions, UH-1N, Common Vertical Lift Support Platform helicopters, and Minuteman III ICBMs.

A1.1.11. Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, a subordinate of AFMC, will be the Lead for CONUS Weapons Storage Area sustainment mission requirements.

A1.1.12. **(Added-ANG)** For the purpose of this instruction the Air National Guard is a Lead MAJCOM.

A2.1. The Lead MAJCOM for conducting evaluations on units with both Combat Air Forces (CAF) and Mobility Air Forces (MAF) assigned will be the MAJCOM with the preponderance of weapon systems.

A2.1.1. For evaluations of mixed CAF/MAF units, the LCAT will use the standard LCAT checklist and the CAF supplement for the CAF units and the MAF supplement for the MAF units.

Attachment 2

LCAP UNIT REPORT FORMAT

A2.1. LCAP Unit Report Format. The LCAP Unit Report will be provided by the parent MAJCOM A4 following the format described below. Refer to [paragraph 4.2](#) for report process.

A2.1.1. Submit the final report on MAJCOM letterhead in a write-protected format signed by the LCAT Team Chief and endorsed by the Lead MAJCOM A4 or Deputy A4 in coordination with the C-MAJCOM when applicable.

A2.2. The report will contain, at a minimum, the following sections.

A2.2.1. **Executive Summary:** Provides a concise narrative of the overall evaluation results for the host unit, i.e. the highest unit assessed. Additionally, the executive summary shall comment on any correlation between LCAP findings and findings from previously conducted evaluations.

A2.2.2. **LCAP Scorecard:** Provides a color-coded summary of LCAP unit scores. Refer to [paragraph A2.2.11](#) for a scorecard example.

A2.2.3. **Evaluation Team:** Provides a list of the entire LCAP Team that participated in the evaluation.

A2.2.4. **Key Personnel Contacted:** The host unit will provide a list of key leadership personnel and their duty positions contacted during the LCAP evaluation for inclusion in the LCAP Unit Report.

A2.2.5. **Unit Evaluation Summary:** Provides a narrative summary of each evaluated unit at the lowest reasonable level of an organization based on the scope of the evaluation. It shall include an overall unit score and comments shall be categorized into the appropriate Focus Area defined in [paragraph 3.4](#) as applicable.

A2.2.6. **Findings:** Provides a complete listing of the failed evaluations, inspections, and observations as defined in [paragraph 3.5](#). All findings must include applicable references.

A2.2.6.1. The findings shall be segregated by the unit evaluated and categorized into one of the Focus Areas defined in [paragraph 3.4](#). MAJCOMs may attach a separate computer-generated listing of findings in lieu of this section as long as program intent is met.

A2.2.7. **Other Significant Findings:** Provides a narrative of findings outside the scope of the unit LCAP evaluation but significant enough to warrant MAJCOM and AF attention. These findings identify issues beyond the unit's ability to control or affect. They will not be included in the unit's LCAP score.

A2.2.8. **(Optional) Recommended Improvement Areas.** Provides a summary of processes, products, or capabilities which could be improved by a suggested course of action.

A2.2.9. **(Optional) Unit Strengths.** Provides a summary of unit strengths and positive processes observed during the evaluation. The LCAT Team Chief may identify potential Best Practices following the procedures contained in AFH 38-210, *Air Force Best Practices Clearinghouse*.

A2.2.10. **(Optional) Outstanding Performers:** The LCAT Team Chief may elect to identify personnel or teams that demonstrate a superior level of professional excellence and personal responsibility.

A2.2.10. **(ANG)** The ANG LCAP team recognizes Honor roll members, Outstanding Performers, Outstanding Teams, and Outstanding Units. These individuals' names will be listed in the inspected unit's report and each Outstanding Performer and Outstanding Team will be presented a certificate. There is no grade restriction on who may be selected. All military nominees must comply with the dress and appearance standards outlined in AFI 36-2903, Dress and Personal Appearance of Air Force Personnel, comply with the Air Force Fitness Program, and must not have an Unfavorable Information File. Outstanding Units will be awarded a trophy award.

A2.2.10.1. **(Added-ANG)** Honor roll members are individuals at any level in the organization whose individual performance was identified by the LCAP Team members for their positive attitudes, display of extensive knowledge, and hard work.

A2.2.10.2. **(Added-ANG)** Outstanding Performers are individuals at any level in the organization whose individual performance is well above his/her peers and whose excellence significantly contributes to accomplishing the unit's mission.

A2.2.10.3. **(Added-ANG)** Outstanding Teams consist of individuals whose collective performance significantly contributes to the unit's mission. Inspectors identify Outstanding Teams by direct observation or review of the teams' accomplishments and impact on the unit's mission.

A2.2.10.4. **(Added-ANG)** Outstanding Units consist of units whose collective performance significantly contributes to the USAF/ANG mission. The NGB/A4Q Division Chief identifies outstanding units by both direct observation and review of the unit's accomplishments and impact on the USAF/ANG mission.

A2.2.11. **Sample Wing Rating Summary Table:** The below table is used to summarize the unit results of the LCAP evaluation. The table shall include the evaluated Wing(s) (or equivalent) and subordinate units down to the lowest reasonable level.

Table A2.1. Sample Wing Rating Summary Table.

<i>UNIT</i>	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	SATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	UNSAT
Wing X			88.7%		
Group A		93%			
Squadron A1		94.7%			
Squadron A2		92.5%			
Group B			81%		
Squadron B1	97%				
Squadron B2			83%		
ETC.				73.6%	

Attachment 3

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A3.1. General Evaluation Guidance. The procedures in this attachment apply to all evaluations including nuclear tasks. Evaluation requirements specific to nuclear LCAT evaluations are clearly identified.

A3.1.1. Evaluators can conduct evaluations on any personnel who perform, supervise, inspect, evaluate, instruct, or train a logistics task. This includes nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon systems, warheads, nuclear support equipment and/or their components.

A3.1.2. The term “technician/team” used in this attachment includes personnel who are supervisors, evaluators, trainers, and inspectors. It also includes personnel who instruct a technical task involving on-equipment task performances governed by a technical data training reference.

A3.1.3. Evaluations will encompass tool usage, general maintenance practices, technical data usage, conduct of logistics processes, adherence to instructions/manuals/directives, nuclear surety practices, etc.

A3.1.4. Evaluators may conduct an evaluation while using training items or in training facilities.

A3.1.5. To the maximum extent possible, before conducting an evaluation, evaluators must verify the technician/team under evaluation is task certified in their Training Business Area, Career Field Education and Training Plan (CFETP), or AF FORM 2435, *Load Training and Certification Document*. This verification must be completed before the final grade is validated.

A3.1.6. When selecting tasks for evaluation, evaluators must ensure they evaluate a variety of tasks involving different equipment and/or different actions for each technician/team. In addition, they must ensure evaluations cover various systems for which a unit is qualified.

A3.1.7. To the maximum extent possible, evaluators will have their own copy of technical data/instructions available for the task being evaluated. If unavailable, the evaluator will confirm the currency of the technical data/instructions used to accomplish the task.

A3.1.8. Evaluations will only be accomplished during actual task performance or while inspecting equipment or documentation. Evaluators will not participate in the task being performed.

A3.1.9. Evaluators must afford every reasonable opportunity for technicians/teams to detect a defect or deficiency.

A3.1.10. Nuclear weapons maintenance and handling evaluations may be performed on trainers or in training facilities. When using trainers, the unit must treat the trainer as if it is War Reserve (WR). See T.O. 11N-25-1, *Department of Defense Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspection System* for additional guidance concerning this information.

A3.1.11. Evaluations on nuclear weapons maintenance and handling certifiable tasks identified in AFI 21-204, *Nuclear Weapons Maintenance Procedures* must be performed by 7-level or above, Job Qualification Standard (JQS) qualified evaluators.

A3.2. Evaluation Briefing. Before starting an evaluation, the evaluator will conduct a briefing with the technician/team. During the briefing, the evaluator must advise the technician/team of the following:

A3.2.1. The evaluation starts when the technician/team begins the task, or portion of the task to be evaluated, and is completed when the entire task or previously determined portion of the task is finished. For tasks already in progress, the evaluator will notify the technician/team they are under evaluation and brief them as soon as practical.

A3.2.2. All logistics actions performed are subject to evaluation.

A3.2.3. Safety and security should not be compromised for any reason.

A3.2.4. All detected errors during the evaluation will be used to calculate an overall award of “Pass” or “Fail”.

A3.2.5. The technician/team can request permission from the evaluator to take short breaks not to exceed 15 minutes during the evaluation. The evaluator will use professional discretion to approve or disapprove the request.

A3.2.6. The technician/team must notify the evaluator of applicable information that could affect the task evaluation. This includes any Previously Complied With (PCW) task(s)/step(s). If the technician/team fails to do this, they may be charged with an error for requirements that were omitted during the task performance that were not identified as PCW prior to the evaluation critique.

A3.2.7. The evaluator may ask questions to determine technician/team knowledge of the task under evaluation. The technician/team may use technical references to answer any questions.

A3.2.8. The technician/team is responsible for completion of all tasks and related actions. The evaluator's presence does not shift this responsibility.

A3.2.9. The technician/team may ask for technical help from personnel/agencies normally available during day-to-day operations. The LCAT evaluator will use professional discretion to determine if the request and time delay are reasonable.

A3.2.10. For nuclear LCAT evaluations, the evaluator will not be considered the second person to satisfy the Two-Person Concept.

A3.3. Evaluator Task Performance Actions. During every task evaluation, the evaluator must detect and correct, to the maximum extent possible, all errors. The evaluator must select the best option available to correct the situation. It may be advantageous to correct minor errors during the critique phase; other errors may warrant immediate correction. The evaluator should consider giving the technician/team the opportunity to make decisions on courses of action on their own using the resources available to them.

A3.3.1. All detected errors during the evaluation will be used to calculate an overall grade using the criteria listed in **Table A3.1**.

A3.3.2. Detected errors during the evaluation will be classified as “Major” or “Minor” using the criteria listed in **Table A3.2**

A3.3.3. Technicians/Teams that commit any error classified as a “Major” in **Table A3.2** anytime during the evaluation process will be rated “Fail”.

A3.3.4. If the evaluator determines during the evaluation that a technician/team cannot correctly or safely accomplish the task without excessive outside intervention or assistance, the evaluator must apply the following guidelines:

A3.3.4.1. Terminate the task immediately.

A3.3.4.2. Notify the technician's/team's work center supervisor or Flight CC/Superintendent.

A3.4. Evaluator Post-Task Performance Actions. The evaluator must perform the following actions as soon as practical after the evaluation:

A3.4.1. Award an overall rating of "Pass" or "Fail" for the evaluated task using guidance in **Table A3.1**.

A3.4.2. Critique the technician/team on the entire task. The critique must cover the following:

A3.4.2.1. A detailed explanation of each detected error including who received it, category, mission impact and correct procedures.

A3.4.2.2. A review of the technician's/team's strengths and weaknesses.

A3.4.2.3. Recommended methods of task accomplishment.

A3.4.2.4. An exchange of ideas and techniques.

A3.4.2.5. For failed evaluations, notify the technician's/team's work center supervisor or Flight CC/Superintendent and identify the substandard performance that contributed to the rating.

A3.4.3. Report detected observations outside the scope of the evaluation as a Detected Safety Violation (DSV), Technical Data Violation (TDV), or Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR), based on applicability. For these detected observations, the evaluator will:

A3.4.3.1. Correct the observation immediately, if possible.

A3.4.3.2. Document all facts surrounding the observation for report purposes.

A3.4.3.3. Notify LCAT leadership of the observation for verification purposes.

A3.4.3.4. Ensure the verified observation is included in the initial report.

A3.4.4. Render an Evaluation Report using an AF Form 2419, *Routing and Review of Quality Control Reports*, or AF Form 2420, *Quality Control Inspection Summary*, or a computer-generated report that meets the forms' minimum requirements.

A3.5. Additional Trainer Proficiency Evaluation (TPE) Guidelines. In addition to the general guidelines described in **paragraphs A3.1** thru **A3.4**, when conducting TPEs, LCAT evaluators will:

A3.5.1. Coordinate with unit instructors/trainers on which tasks are acceptable for TPEs.

A3.5.2. Brief the following items to the instructor/trainer under evaluation:

A3.5.2.1. The instructor/trainer must prevent/immediately correct the following: Weapon System Safety Rules (WSSR) violations, weapon system code compromises, Two-Person Concept violations, significant security violations or safety errors which could result in

serious injury to personnel, failure to use required technical data during the logistics process and any error which could result in potential/imminent equipment damage or personnel injury.

A3.5.2.2. The instructor/trainer must correct other errors before completing the training session. This correction may include anything from verbal feedback to re-accomplishment of the erroneous procedures. The training session is considered complete when the instructor/trainer critiques the student's performance.

A3.5.2.3. Evaluators will not generate an evaluation report on the trainees. The evaluation will focus solely on the instructor's/trainer's proficiency and the efficiency of training delivered. Errors committed by the trainees will have no impact on the evaluation unless the instructor/trainer does not detect and correct the errors.

A3.5.2.4. Evaluators will consider the instructor's/trainer's familiarity with procedures, use of and adherence to technical data and lesson plans, verbal skills, ability to clearly and precisely describe procedures, and the degree of control over the trainees.

A3.5.2.5. A TPE will be rated "Fail" if the instructor/trainer does not detect, correct, and provide/defer re-training for any error classified as "Major" using criteria described in [Table A3.2](#) of this instruction. Additionally, the evaluation will also be rated as "Fail" if an incomplete training process takes place such as failing to instruct critical portions of the task.

A3.6. Trainer Maintainer Proficiency Evaluations (TMPE). MAJCOMs with nuclear-capable units evaluate unit trainer maintainers to assess their ability to operate/maintain unit nuclear trainers. Nuclear capable MAJCOM LCAT evaluators will follow the evaluation procedures described in this attachment to conduct TMPEs.

Table A3.1. Evaluation Acceptable Quality Level (AQL) Grading Criteria.

R U L E	If the Individual/Team Committed	AND	Award a grade of
1	No Major errors	The accumulation of Minor errors does not exceed the AQL.	Pass
2	One or more Major errors	N/A	Fail
3	No Major errors	The accumulation of Minor errors exceeds the AQL.	
4	No Major errors	More than four (4) Minor errors on a nuclear weapons maintenance certifiable (AF IMT 2435) task	
5	No Major errors	More than two (2) Minor errors on a nuclear weapons handling certifiable (AF IMT 2435) task	
NOTE: When applying the Rating Criteria, consider the following:			

1. Number of tasks evaluated. (Not general tasks such as use of technical data, common hand tools, etc.)
2. Complexity and frequency of tasks evaluated.
3. Reasonable impact of each error committed.
4. Complexity of the program being inspected.

Table A3.2. Evaluation Error Criteria Description.**GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

NOTE: The Major and Minor Errors listed in this table are not all-inclusive. The LCAT evaluator has the authority to identify Major or Minor Errors that are not listed in this table.

MAJOR ERRORS:

1. Violation of Weapon System Safety Rules. An error that would violate weapon system safety rules pertaining to maintenance on weapon systems (Actual or Possible). (Refs. AFI 91-114, *Safety Rules for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Systems* and AFI 91-111, *Safety Rules for US Strategic Bomber Aircraft*).
2. Significant Safety Error. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, would result in injury to personnel caused by an individual's disregard or lack of attention to safety precautions.
3. Significant Equipment Damage. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, would damage a support equipment/weapon system component to the extent it cannot be used for its intended purpose. This does not include damage to common hand tools.
4. Code Handling Violation. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, would result in a code compromise (Actual or Possible).
5. Violation of Two-Person Concept. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, would result in a compromise of a no-lone zone or critical component(s) (Actual or Possible).
6. Significant Security Violations. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, would result in compromise of the weapon system, subsystem, or support equipment (Actual or Possible).
7. Failure to have available and comply with required technical data while performing an action.
8. Individual not trained/certified on task being performed.
9. Failure to accomplish a critical portion of a task that results in incomplete task performance by not verifying the operability/serviceability of support equipment, subsystem, or weapon system component.
10. Failure to document actions/conditions that, as a reasonable expectation, would result in erroneous equipment availability status or weapon system status; or create a significant safety/security deficiency.
11. Failure to recognize an unacceptable condition/test result that is cause for rejection of equipment or prevents support equipment/system or weapon system component from operating.
12. Failure to recognize an acceptable condition/test that caused rejection of serviceable components or equipment.
13. Clearly demonstrated inability to successfully complete the task due to a lack of job knowledge. Cannot correctly or safely accomplish task without excessive outside intervention.
14. Failure to follow custody transfer procedures.
15. A condition which creates an unreliable nuclear weapon, and unsafe environment, or an insecure environment as defined in T.O. 11N-25-1, *Department of Defense Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspection System*, Section 3-2.2.

16. A condition that creates an unreliable missile, missile component, equipment item or an unsafe or insecure environment.

17. Failure to ensure proper storage, shipment and positive inventory control of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon systems, Nuclear Weapons Related Materiel (NWRM), classified assets, Controlled Cryptographic Item (CCI)/ Communication Security (COMSEC), equipment, serialized control items, weapons, and sensitive assets.

18. Significant system input errors. Errors that, as a reasonable expectation based on quantity or sensitivity of the input(s) would result in significant loss of data accuracy.

MINOR ERRORS:

1. An error that does not prevent a support equipment/weapon system component from being used for its intended purpose, but would, as a reasonable expectation, have a detrimental effect on the operational life of the component/equipment/system. This may include damage to common hand tools due to misuse.

2. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, could require support equipment to be returned to another agency for recalibration/reverification.

3. An error that lacks the seriousness to meet the criteria for a major error.

4. Failure to read a warning or caution is a minor error, provided the warning/caution is not violated.

ADDITIONAL TRAINER PROFICIENCY EVALUATION (TPE) CRITERIA

MAJOR ERRORS:

1. Failure to detect/correct a major error.

2. Failure to have available/utilize lesson plan.

3. Trainer certifies a student(s) who failed to meet the training objective.

4. Failure to provide students with technically accurate information. Consider the impact of the information.

5. Incomplete training process was performed.

MINOR ERRORS:

1. Failure to document the training session.

2. Failure to detect/correct a minor error.

ADDITIONAL EVALUATOR PROFICIENCY EVALUATION (EPE) CRITERIA

MAJOR ERRORS:

1. Evaluator awarded a major error and/or unsatisfactory rating when no condition existed.

2. Failure to brief/critique technicians.

3. Failure to observe critical portions of the task.

4. Failure to retrain/defer retraining of a major error.

5. Ensured task completion through interference or influence.

6. Failure to detect/stop/correct/document a major error.

MINOR ERRORS:

1. Failure to detect/correct a minor error.

2. Failure to brief/critique a required item.

3. Failure to document a critiqued error.

4. Did not provide a realistic mission impact statement.

5. Awarded a minor error when no condition existed and/or provided erroneous corrective instruction.

Attachment 4**LCAP SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE**

A4.1. During a particular LCAP evaluation, a unit is subjected to 150 Evaluations and Inspections. Of those 150 events, 135 are rated as passed. Additionally, during the evaluation, the LCAT observed 2 DSVs, 1 TDV and identified 1 repeat finding.

A4.2. To obtain the overall grade.

A4.2.1. Calculate the unit's baseline score. Baseline Score: 135 passed events divided by 150 total events = 90%.

A4.2.2. Calculate the deductions. Deductions: 4 penalties (2 DSVs + 1 TDV + 1 repeat) multiplied by .5% = 2%.

A4.2.3. The unit overall grade is calculated by subtracting the deductions from the baseline score. Unit Overall Score: 90% baseline - 2% deductions = 88%.

A4.2.4. Using the five-tier grading scale from **paragraph 3.9.3**, the unit is rated "Satisfactory."

Attachment 5 (Added-ANG)**GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION***Abbreviations and Acronyms*

AATC-- Air National Guard / Air Force Reserve Test Center

AD--Alert Detachments

ANG--Air National Guard

BDT--Bureau Directed Travel

CIRF--Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities

CRTC--Combat Readiness Training Centers

FOL--Forward Operating Locations

GSU--Geographically Separated Units

IW--Intelligence Wings

LGTTTP--LG Total Travel Program

LRS--Logistics Readiness Squadron

MSG--Mission Support Group

MXG--Maintenance Group

NGB/A4Q-- NGB Inspections Division

POC--Point of Contact

RW--Reconnaissance Wings

QAR--Quality Assurance Representative

UTA--Unit Training Assembly