

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER
21ST SPACE WING**

**21st SPACE WING
INSPECTION CHECKLIST 10-9**



1 MARCH 2001

Operations

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT (WING/GROUP/UNIT)

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at: <http://afpubs.hq.af.mil>.

OPR: 21 OG/OGV (MSgt J. Manns)

Certified by: 21 OG/OGV (Lt Col G. Wilson)

Supersedes: N/A

Pages: 6

Distribution: F

This checklist reflects 21st Space Wing requirements for Operational Procedure Development Programs for AFSPC Space Operations at wing, group and unit levels to prepare for and conduct internal reviews.

1. References have been provided for each inspection item. Critical items have been kept to a minimum, and are related to public law, safety, security, fiscal responsibility, mission accomplishment, and/or HHQ requirements. Asterisked critical items (if present) are those items that if not accomplished in support of primary mission could result in an overall Wing/Group/Unit assessment rating of less than satisfactory.
2. This publication establishes a baseline checklist. The checklist will also be used by the Wing/Group Operations Standardization Teams (OST) during applicable assessments. Use the checklist at **Attachment 1** as a guide only. Add to or modify each area as needed to ensure an effective and thorough review of a unit's Operational Procedure Development Programs.

THOMAS D. SHEARER, Colonel, USAF
Chief of Operations

Attachment 1

OPERATIONAL PROCEDURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (WING/GROUP/UNIT)

Table A1.1. Checklist.

| SECTION 1: WING/GROUP | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|
| MISSION STATEMENT: Establish policy, basic requirements and provide guidance for unit operational procedure development programs. | | | |
| NOTE: All references are from 21SWI10-9, <i>Operational Procedure Development</i> , unless otherwise noted. | | | |
| 1.1. TECHNICAL DATA (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
| 1.1.1. Does OGV coordinate with affected unit(s) to publish an implementation plan following verification, which includes the following tasks? (para 2.2.2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projected implementation date (para 2.2.2.1) - TO account verification/distribution (para 2.2.2.2) - Program development (para 2.2.2.3) - 533 TRS courseware change (para 2.2.2.4) - Training/Evaluation administration (para 2.2.2.5) | | | |
| 1.1.2. When 533 TRS provides IQT support, does OGV notify HQ AFSPC/DOTT, 14 AF/OV and 533 TRS of pending TO implementation? (para 2.2.2.4) | | | |
| 1.1.3. When 533 TRS provides IQT support, does OSS/OSOT initiate a request for a major courseware revision to HQ AFSPC/DOTT upon completion of the TO verification effort? (para 2.2.2.4) | | | |
| 1.1.4. Does OGV notify HQ AFSPC/DOTT and 14 AF/OV when all implementation actions are complete for each TO? (para 2.2.3) | | | |
| 1.1.5. Does OGV coordinate change requests with appropriate offices (e.g., OSS) to make the final approval/disapproval determination? (para 2.4.1) | | | |
| 1.1.6. Does OGV compile minor correction requests from the units and ensure they are incorporated into the next TO change/revision? (para 2.4.2) | | | |
| 1.1.7. Does OGV notify units of AFTO 22 approval/disapproval? (para 2.4.3) | | | |
| 1.1.8. Does OGV get written coordination for all change requests from HQ AFSPC? (para 2.4.4) | | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.1.9. Does OGV forward Local Page Supplements (LPS) directly to the affected unit(s) and 533 TRS (if they provide IQT support for the system)? (para 2.4.6.4.1) | | | |
| 1.2. POSITIONAL CHECKLISTS (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
| 1.2.1. Does OGV maintain a current copy of all GSU locally developed ops procedures OI's in a master reference library for use in addressing training, standardization/evaluation, Operations Review Board, etc., issues (para 3.1.1) | | | |
| 1.2.2. Does OGV evaluate change requests to instruction templates for accuracy, potential impacts, training/evaluation requirements, etc., and coordinate the change request with all 21 SW units (para 3.4.2.2) | | | |
| 1.2.3. Does OGV ensure a record of the coordination chain and validation date is maintained for all instruction template checklist changes/revisions. (para 3.4.2.2) | | | |
| SECTION 2: UNIT | | | |
| MISSION STATEMENT: Implement Wing operational procedure development program. | | | |
| NOTE: All references are from 21SWI10-9, unless otherwise noted. | | | |
| 2.1. TECHNICAL DATA (CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
| 2.1.1. Do units ensure redlined copies of the TO are not used to train, evaluate or conduct on-position operations? (para 2.2.1) | | | |
| 2.1.2. Do units NOT conduct on-position operations with a TO until approval is received from the Group Commander (or designated representative)? (para 2.2.1) | | | |
| 2.2. TECHNICAL DATA (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
| 2.2.1. Do units accomplish the following tasks in preparation for TO implementation? (para 2.2.2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projected implementation date (para 2.2.2.1) - TO account verification/distribution (para 2.2.2.2) - Program development (para 2.2.2.3) - Training/Evaluation administration (para 2.2.2.5) - Official TO publication (para 2.2.2.6) | | | |
| 2.2.2. Do units inform OGV when all implementation actions are complete? (para 2.2.3) | | | |
| 2.2.3. (paper copy TO units only) Do unit Standardization and Evaluation sections (DOV) ensure all TO copies are properly numbered, distributed and maintained? (para 2.3.1) | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 2.2.4. (Interactive Electronic Technical Manual (IETM) units only) Is unit DOV responsible for properly posting and maintaining current electronic file copies for IETMs? (para 2.3.1) | | | |
| 2.2.5. Do units ensure operator TO's remain fully intact? (para 2.3.2) | | | |
| 2.2.6. Do units ensure personnel DO NOT make pen and ink changes to TOs unless directed by an Interim Operational Supplement (IOS)? (para 2.3.2) | | | |
| 2.2.7. Do units conduct and document TO A-Page checks at least annually, and after receipt of a revision or immediately after posting any supplements or changes? (para 2.3.2) | | | |
| 2.2.8. When developing change requests, do units consider whether or not the change may impact other areas of the TO? (para 2.4.1) | | | |
| 2.2.9. When developing change requests, do units conduct on-site coordination/validation to ensure technical and procedural accuracy? (para 2.4.1) | | | |
| 2.2.10. When more than one unit uses the same TO, do units ensure sister site coordination is accomplished prior to change request submission? (para 2.4.1) | | | |
| 2.2.11. When 533 TRS provide IQT support, do units include them in the TO change request coordination? (para 2.4.1) | | | |
| 2.2.12. Do units ensure AFTO Form 22's are approved by OGV prior to posting a Temporary Procedure (TP) against the operator TO? (para 2.4.2) | | | |
| 2.2.13. Do units use the Comments section of the AFTO Form 22 to indicate the on-site, sister site and 533 TRS (if they provide IQT support for the system) coordination chain? (para 2.4.2) | | | |
| 2.2.14. Do units provide a detailed rationale for the proposed change request? (para 2.4.2) | | | |
| 2.2.15. Do units ensure AFTO Form 22's are not submitted for minor inaccuracies of a non-technical nature (e.g. administrative corrections) unless the error affects the meaning of instructive information or procedures? (para 2.4.2) | | | |
| 2.2.16. (paper copy TO units only) Do units correctly verify and post LPS's? (para 2.4.6.4.1) | | | |
| 2.2.17. Do units determine training and evaluation requirements resulting from LPS, Change Pages, or Revisions? (para 2.4.7) | | | |
| 2.2.18. When required, do units fulfill training and evaluation requirements as a result of LPS, Change Pages, or Revisions before using the TO on-position? (para 2.4.7) | | | |

| 2.3. POSITIONAL CHECKLISTS (CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|
| 2.3.1. For all procedures requiring mandatory reference, do units ensure the checklist is opened and referenced while processing the procedure and steps are processed in sequential order or simultaneously at the discretion of the Crew Commander? (para 5) | | | |
| 2.4. POSITIONAL CHECKLISTS (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
| 2.4.1. Do Non-TO units develop all checklists necessary to complete mission requirements, to include contingency checklists? (para 3.1) | | | |
| 2.4.2. Do TO units only develop Positional (Space Crew Contingency) Checklists for procedures not provided in the operator TO? (para 3.1) | | | |
| 2.4.3. Do units develop and maintain an Operating Instruction (OI) that will provide guidance for developing, coordinating, validating, and approving locally developed Positional Checklists? (para 3.1.1) | | | |
| 2.4.4. Do units, as a minimum, create an OI that includes an index of all Positional Checklists and Job Aids, and incorporate all Positional Checklists within the OI (e.g., attachments, appendices, etc.), and provide guidance for developing, coordinating, validating and approving locally developed Positional Checklists? (para 3.1.1) | | | |
| 2.4.5. Do units provide a complete copy of the OI (and any classified supplements) to OGV? (para 3.1.1) | | | |
| 2.4.6. Do units develop an index in their OI, posted immediately in front of the first checklist, that provides the following information: checklist number, checklist classification, checklist title, date reviewed and date approved? (para 3.1.1.1) | | | |
| 2.4.7. Do units ensure Job Aids do not serve as procedural checklists? (para 3.1.1.3) | | | |
| 2.4.8. Do units develop Positional Checklists in the Demand-Response format as specified in the MIL-PRF-38314? (para 3.1.2) | | | |
| 2.4.9. Do units develop Positional Checklists following the rules established in this instruction? (para 3.1.2.1.1 through 3.1.2.1.8) | | | |
| 2.4.10. Prior to implementing a new or changed checklist, do units ensure a thorough coordination of each checklist has been accomplished? (para 3.2) | | | |
| 2.4.11. Do units review all checklists on an as needed basis and at a minimum annually to ensure accuracy, currency and mission applicability? (para 3.3) | | | |
| 2.4.12. When checklists require no changes, do units update the review date on the OI index to indicate the date the review was accomplished? (para 3.3) | | | |

| | | | |
|---|------------|-----------|------------|
| 2.4.13. For all types of positional checklists, do units conduct on-site coordination and validation as defined in unit's OI, to ensure technical and procedural accuracy? (para 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2) | | | |
| 2.4.14. Do units supported by 533 TRS IQT course coordinate positional checklist changes with the 533 TRS? (para 3.4.1 and 3.4.2.1) | | | |
| 2.4.15. When units update their local OI, are the updates also provided to OGV? (para 3.4.1, 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2) | | | |
| 2.4.16. Do units ensure a record of the coordination chain and validation date is maintained for all checklist changes? (para 3.4.1 and 3.4.2.1) | | | |
| 2.4.17. For changes that affect sister unit(s), does the originating unit coordinate changes with the sister unit(s) and obtain concurrence prior to approving the change? (para 3.4.2.1) | | | |
| 2.4.18. Have units developed applicable 21 SW common standardized checklists IAW this instruction? (para 6, Attachments 2 through 13) | | | |
| 2.4.19. Do units obtain OGV approval prior to deviating from format and content specified in the standardized checklist templates? (para 6) | | | |
| 2.5. TEMPORARY PROCEDURES (TP) (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS) | YES | NO | N/A |
| 2.5.1. When TPs become necessary, do units develop and maintain them IAW guidance provided in AFSPCI10-1202/14AF1? (para 11.3.3.2.1.1 through 11.3.4.4) | | | |
| 2.5.2. When TP's are posted in Positional Checklist binders or TOs, do units ensure the TP page(s) are clearly identifiable (e.g., copy the TP on colored paper and post it opposite the affected checklist/TO page(s), type "TP" in bold, capital letters next to the checklist number, etc)? (para 4) | | | |
| 2.5.3. Do units ensure all TPs are locally coordinated and validated prior to final implementation? (para 4.1) | | | |
| 2.5.4. For sites using the same operational system (i.e., PAVE PAWS), does the initiating unit obtain sister unit(s) coordination and concurrence prior to TP implementation? (para 4.1) | | | |
| 2.5.5. For TO units, do units ensure TPs affecting TO procedures are coordinated and approved by sister unit(s)? (para 4.1) | | | |
| 2.5.6. Do units document the coordination chain and validation date for all TPs and maintain for a minimum of one year after removal? (para 4.1) | | | |