

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

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 20-111



19 APRIL 2011

**AIR NATIONAL GUARD
Supplement**

2 OCTOBER 2012

Logistics

**LOGISTICS COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT
PROGRAM (LCAP)**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing website at 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 Judith Fedder)

Pages: 42

(ANG)

OPR: NGB/A4Q

Certified by: NGB/A4
(Mr. Charles Melton)

Pages: 5

Supersedes: AFI20-111_ANGSUP,
3 June 2010

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 United States Air Force (USAF) logistics community, and provides senior leadership and management direction for standardizing and verifying the accomplishment of the mission in accordance with Department of Defense (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, Field Operating Agencies (FOA), Direct Report Units (DRU) including the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) and the Air National Guard (ANG), along with their subordinates. The Air National Guard is a MAJCOM for the purpose of this instruction. For assistance with interpreting this instruction, contact your MAJCOM functional policy activity. Deviation and 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 Air Force (AF) Form 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 Air Force Manual (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/afirms/afirms/afirms/rims.cfm>.

(ANG) This supplement implements and extends the guidance of Air Force Instruction (AFI) 20-111, *Logistics Compliance Assessment Program (LCAP)*, 19 April 2011. 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. 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 the AF Form 847 from the field through major command (MAJCOM) publications/forms managers. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with Air Force Manual 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located in Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) at Air Force (AF) Portal: <https://my.af.mil/afirms/afirms/afirms/rims.cfm>

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This instruction has been significantly changed and should be reviewed in its entirety. Standardized terminology has been added to the Contractor Managed Organizations paragraph to ensure cohesion between the LCAP Team and the Contracting Officer. Expanded responsibilities of the Headquarters Air Force (HAF), MAJCOMs and Evaluated Units have been established. Additionally, clarifications of revisit inspections and grading criteria have been implemented.

(ANG) This publication has been significantly revised to reflect the changes to AFI20-111. . Review it in its entirety

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

AFI20-111_ANGSUP_I 2 OCTOBER 2012	3
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:	11
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.	13
3.5. LCAP Methodology.	14
3.6. LCAP Checklists	16
3.7. Findings	16
3.8. Acceptable Quality Levels (AQL).	16
3.9. LCAP Grading.	17
Table 3.1. Grading Scale	17
3.10. LCAP Scoring.	17
Chapter 4—LCAP REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	18
4.1. LCAP Status Report.	18
4.2. LCAP Unit Report.	18
4.3. LCAP Out Brief.	18
4.4. LCAP Finding Response Form.	18
4.5. LCAP Report Handling.	19
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCE AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION	21
Attachment 2—LEAD MAJCOM DESIGNATIONS	25
Attachment 3—LCAP UNIT REPORT FORMAT	26
Attachment 4—EVALUATION PROCEDURES	32
Attachment 5—LCAP SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE	40
Attachment 6—AIR FORCE FORM 4395	41

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 higher headquarters 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; cyber and space; special operations; wholesale-level procurement, sustainment, and maintenance; aerial port squadrons; logistics readiness squadrons; logistics support to research, test, and development units; and logistics support to special access programs. It does not include medical logistics, civil engineering logistics, security forces units, communications units, 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), Type II Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory (Type II PMEL), 137 SWS, and the 153 CACS.

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.

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

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 DoD 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 generation, launch, recovery, ground handling, and servicing of all weapons systems. 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 and ensures 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, partnering agreements, directives and/or supplements. 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. The LCAP assessment will be conducted in accordance with (IAW) the contract and associate Performance Work Statement (PWS)/Statement of Work (SOW). Additionally, the LCAP evaluation shall be conducted in conjunction with the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and IAW 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), contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR), and Quality Assurance Representative (QAR). Performance Management Assessment Program (PMAP) and Performance Plan (P-Plan) are both synonymous with the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP).

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/SOW, 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 QASP, P-Plan or PMAP for that contract.

1.3.3.2.2. Evaluate that the COR is providing effective oversight of the contract by ensuring that the QASP, P-Plan or PMAP 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/SOW requirements and service deliverable 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 report format.
- 2.1.4. Review reports for trends and effectiveness of program.
- 2.1.5. Provide a summary of Air Force-wide LCAP results to Chief of Staff of the Air Force (CSAF)/Secretary of the Air Force (SECAF) and MAJCOMs.
- 2.1.6. Develop a method to share trends, reports and critical LCAP information across the AF logistics community.
- 2.1.7. Manage the AF Logistics Interest Item (LII) program by coordinating AF LII topic proposals, distribute approved Headquarters Air Force (HAF) directed LIIs to MAJCOM/LCAP Team Chiefs, compile and forward LII data to the sponsoring agency.

2.2. Lead Major Command (MAJCOM) A4 will:

- 2.2.1. Administer, manage, plan, fund and execute all aspects of the LCAP for their MAJCOM/CC, Component Major Command (C-MAJCOM) and supported DRUs/FOAs. Coordination will be made with the C-MAJCOM to ensure program standardization. Refer to Attachment 2 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 ie., (unique mission requirements). Post supplemented checklists on the MAJCOM LCAP Community of Practice (CoP).
- 2.2.4. Compile and forward LCAP results as directed by AF/A4L for 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 2 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.

2.2.8. Organize a Logistics Compliance Assessment Program Team 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 LCAP Team or organize them on a temporary basis to conduct evaluations.

2.2.8. **(ANG)** Assessment Team Augmentation. NGB/A4Q/A4M/A4R and units will provide qualified personnel to augment ANG LCAPs. Unit augmentees will be trained on evaluation techniques to include receiving an Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPE) prior to LCAP augmentation. 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 paid voucher within five working days after completion of travel to ensure reimbursement. 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 LCAP Teams to include temporary augmentation requirements.

2.2.8.1. **(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.

2.2.8.1.1. **(Added-ANG)** Requests to observe will be prioritized based on factors such as projected assessment dates and date of request. Individual wings may request a maximum of two observers to any given assessment however the maximum total number from all Wings on any assessment will be six. Not later than 30 days prior to the assessment, 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.

2.2.8.1.2. **(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.

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

2.2.8.1.4. **(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 assessment. Observers must not interfere in any way with the operations of the assessment unit or the LCAP team. Observers may not be permitted to attend LCAP team meetings where sensitive unit personnel issues are discussed.

2.2.8.2. Coordinate with the applicable MAJCOM on the equitable augmentation of LCAP Teams as necessary to achieve the standard LCAP frequency for associate units defined in paragraph 3.3.

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

2.2.8.3. Air Reserve Components (ARC) will provide the applicable MAJCOM with projected fiscal year Military Personnel Appropriation (MPA) (all inclusive funding) requirements needed to conduct all required LCAPs within the ARC, including all associate units. MPA support is vital to LCAP execution. The responsibility for conducting LCAPs will revert back to the Active Component Lead MAJCOM if MPA support/funding/manpower is unavailable.

2.2.9. Provide an LCAP report for evaluated units using the template illustrated in Attachment 3. 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*.

2.2.11. Assess all applicable active LIIs during LCAP evaluations. Document the results of LII assessments as a separate section of the final assessment report.

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 2 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 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 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 LCAP Teams 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 2 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 3. 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. Provide closure 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 LCAP Team visits.

2.4.2. Provide required support to the LCAP Team 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, administrative support and Local Area Network (LAN)/Virtual Private Network (VPN) access, and an in/out brief location.

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* http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/shared/media/epubs/AF4395_LOCKED.xfdl. 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. Ensure Contracting Officer is notified if a Contractor Managed Organization is to be assessed under the LCAP.

2.4.5. Obtain LII information via MAJCOM or HAF LCAP CoP.

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 notification time for units will not exceed:

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

3.2.2. Air Reserve Component (ARC) Units: One-hundred 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 MAJCOMS 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 MAJCOM or ANG resource limitations that prevent assembling a sufficient LCAP team. Approval authority cannot be delegated.

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.

3.3.5.1. Logistics activities rated “Marginal” or “Unsatisfactory” will have a follow-up evaluation within 180 days of the conclusion of the initial LCAP evaluation and will receive a grade of either Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory.

3.3.5.2. Additionally, the LCAP Team Chief may revisit any activities/areas deemed substandard regardless of grade. The reevaluated activities/areas will be graded Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory.

3.3.5.3. The follow-up evaluation shall be tailored to properly re-assess the “Marginal”, “Unsatisfactory” or substandard activities/areas.

3.3.5.4. Logistics activities/areas receiving a rating of “Unsatisfactory” during follow-up evaluations will receive additional follow-up assessments until a rating of “Satisfactory” is attained.

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 weapon systems, NWRM, Master Nuclear Certification Listing (MNCL), and Nuclear Certified Equipment (NCE) are safe, secure, and reliable. Ensure weapon system safety rules, owner/user security, and reliability standards are strictly adhered to. Nuclear surety is outlined in AFI 91-101 *Air Force Nuclear Weapons Surety Program* and defined as *materiel, personnel, and procedures which contribute to the security, safety, and reliability of nuclear weapons and to the assurance that there will be no nuclear weapon accidents, incidents, unauthorized weapon detonations, or degradation in performance at the target.*

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. The following three sub-categories will be used to assess performance in this focus area and to facilitate trend analysis:

3.4.3.1. Human Factors: Internal/External situational elements that result in incorrect decision making processes (i.e. stress, time, distractions, complacency, etc...).

3.4.3.2. Inadequate Guidance: The governing guidance is incorrect or poorly stated leading to improper processes or actions (i.e. TOs, AFIs, Supplements, Operating Instructions (OI), Policy Letters, etc...).

3.4.3.3. Documentation: This category indicates a failure to properly document an action, process or task (i.e. removing/replacing component, appointment letters, training completion documentation, etc.)

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, NWRM, MNCL, Nuclear Certified Equipment (NCE), 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 assessments will be conducted through the use of evaluations, inspections, and observations.

3.5.1. Evaluations. An evaluation 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 are subject to a direct evaluation. LCAP Team personnel performing evaluations must have sufficient subject matter expertise to properly and safely conduct the evaluation. Refer to Attachment 4 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. An inspection represents inspections of equipment, programs and processes, often through the use of LCAP functional checklists, to ensure compliance with established standards. Inspections are rated as “Pass” or “Fail”. Inspections include:

3.5.2.1. Quality Verification Inspection (QVI). A QVI is an inspection of equipment condition or a process after an inspection, repair action, and/or task has been completed by a technician or supervisor to assess if it was properly completed. The QVI finding will 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; and Foreign Object Damage (FOD) program, etc. SIs may be condition, procedural or compliance 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. Observations include:

3.5.3.1. Detected Safety Violation (DSV). A DSV is an observed unsafe act by an individual. The LCAP 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 an evaluation rating of “Failed”. 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 proper technical data available but not in use or not following the correct sequence of steps (if directed). 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 an evaluation rating of “Fail”. 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 (e.g., a classified item is found unsecured upon entry into a work center).

3.5.4. Logistics Interest Items (LII). LIIs are other interest items that are identified by Headquarters Air Force and Lead/C-MAJCOMS.

3.5.4.1. LIIs provide a means to focus management attention and/or gather data to evaluate the status of specific programs and conditions in the field requiring AF senior leader attention. LIIs are used by HAF and Lead/C-MAJCOMS functional staffs to make policy adjustments and enhance decision-making. The LII originator will determine the scope and validity period for each LII.

3.5.4.2. Responsibilities.

3.5.4.2.1. HAF/A4L. Manage the AF LII program by coordinating AF LII topic proposals, obtaining HAF/A4/7 approval, distribute approved AF LII to MAJCOM/A4s, compile and forward LII data to the sponsoring agency.

3.5.4.2.2. LII Sponsors. Only HAF/MAJCOM functionals may sponsor LIIs. Proposed LII topics may be initiated at any level but must be submitted by the appropriate HAF/MAJCOM functional to HAF/A4L at af/a4.workflow@pentagon.af.mil. Submit LII topic proposals in the format provided on the HAF/A4L LCAP Community of Practice (CoP).

3.5.4.2.3. MAJCOM/A4s.

3.5.4.2.3.1. LII Inspections. Inspect all applicable active LIIs during formal inspections. Units need only be inspected and reported once during the LII’s active period. Document the results of LII inspections as a separate section of the final inspection report.

3.5.4.2.3.2. LII Reports. Consolidate LII inspection results and report to HAF/A4LM at A4LMM.maintenance@pentagon.af.mil. Provide a summary of

units inspected, locations, dates of inspection, and electronic extract of the LII portion of the final inspection report. A4 remarks are important to the LII process and should be annotated IAW specific instructions attached to each LII.

3.5.4.2.4. Wing/Unit. Obtain LII information via MAJCOM/A4 or HAF/A4L LCAP CoP.

3.5.4.3. Rating. If rating is required as part of the LII, the scale will be specified in the LII instructions.

3.5.4.4. MAJCOM LIIs. Ensure that MAJCOM LIIs do not conflict with AF LIIs.

3.6. LCAP Checklists

3.6.1. 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).

3.6.2. Checklists serve as a guide for MAJCOM LCAP teams to evaluate units and are not all-inclusive nor do they limit the flexibility of LCAP evaluators to address other logistics processes in a unit.

3.6.3. Events. An event is defined as an evaluation or inspection and will receive a “Pass” or “Fail” rating. Failed events will be determined by the number of allowable major/minor errors as outlined in Tables A.4.1 and A.4.2, HAF/MAJCOM, or the local Quality Assurance Program.

3.6.4. Errors. Reference Tables A.3.2 for definition of a major/minor error.

3.7. Findings Findings are validated deficiencies and will be tracked at the appropriate level until resolved. Findings may be a standalone deficiency or a roll up of several similar deficiencies. Findings do not count against a unit’s score unless it is a repeat Major Finding as defined in Paragraph 3.10.2. Findings include

3.7.1. **Major Finding** Any deficiency that results or could result in widespread or significant mission impact or failure. May include any repeat minor finding deemed appropriate by the LCAP Team Chief. Additionally, a systemic finding across the logistics enterprise may be documented as a major finding at the LCAP Team Chief’s discretion. Major findings are tracked and closed out at the MAJCOM level.

3.7.2. **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.

3.8. Acceptable Quality Levels (AQL). AQLs will be used to minimize subjectivity in the LCAP evaluation. An AQL denotes the maximum allowable number of “minor” errors that a task, process or product may receive and still be rated “Pass” see Table A3.1.

3.8.1. Exceeding the AQL standard will result in a task/process rating of “Fail”.

3.8.2. Checklist AQLs will be annotated on the individual checklist as defined by HAF, MAJCOM or local Quality Assurance Programs or any combination of the three.

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 3.

3.9.2. The LCAP 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 are designed as a guide and are 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.

3.9.2. (ANG) The Team Chief or the NGB/A4 may lower the grade but is not permitted to raise the grade(s).

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 “Major” LCAP findings. Refer to Attachment 5 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 Chairmen Joint Chief of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3263.05 *Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspections* 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 3.7 and annotated with “UNACCEPTABLE CONDITION THAT REQUIRES IMMEDIATE ATTENTION.”

Chapter 4

LCAP REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

4.1. LCAP Status Report. Lead MAJCOMs will submit a status report to AF/A4L using the Air Staff developed and published format at the frequency identified by the HAF.

4.1.1. The report will cover the previously completed LCAP activity since the last report, scorecards, as well as projected LCAP inspections.

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; a Draft Report and the Final Report.

4.2.1. A Draft Report will be provided to the evaluated unit prior to LCAP Team departure. LCAP Teams will use the report format found in Attachment 3; 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 major findings in the Draft Report using AF Form 4395, http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/shared/media/epubs/AF4395_LOCKED.xfdl 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 45 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 3. For associate units, the draft and final reports will be provided to all applicable MAJCOM A4s.

4.2.3. Each failed evaluation, inspection, and observation will include the applicable reference(s).

4.3. LCAP Out Brief. The LCAP Team Chief will provide an out brief to the evaluated unit on the final day of the evaluation using the information contained in the draft 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 LCAP Team Chief/Superintendent. Other interested parties may attend upon the mutual agreement of the LCAP Team Chief and the evaluated 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 http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/shared/media/epubs/AF4395_LOCKED.xfdl 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* located on the Air Force Portal <https://www.my.af.mil/afknprod/ASPs/DocMan/DocMain.asp?Filter=OO-TR-AF-43&FolderID=OO-TR-AF-43-13-4&Tab=0%20>

4.4.2. Units will submit responses every 30 days to the MAJCOM LCAP OPR with a cover letter signed by the highest level Commander or equivalent until all major 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) because they contain FOUO information as defined in DOD Regulation 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, DOD 5210.83 *Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information (UCNI)* 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), Table 21-09 R 02.00, *Quality Control Inspection/Evaluation Records*, located on the AF Portal (<https://www.my.af.mil/afirms/afirms/afirms/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 MAJCOM LCAP CoP to foster cross sharing of information. The MAJCOM and AF reports will be posted on the HAF LCAP CoP.

4.6. Prescribed and Adopted Forms

AF IMT 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AF Form 4395, *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

(ANG)

Harry M Wyatt III, Lieutenant General, USAF
Director, Air National Guard

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

Title 5 USC 552, *Freedom of Information Act*

DOD Regulation 5200.1-R, *Department of Defense Information Security Program*, Jan 1997

DOD Instruction 5210.83, *Department of Defense Unclassified Control Nuclear Information*, 15 Nov 1991

DOD Regulation 5400.7-R Air Force Supplement, *Department of Defense Freedom of Information Act Program*, 2 Jan 2008

Federal Acquisition Regulation 46.102 (d), *Quality Assurance Policy*

CJCSI 3263.05, *Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspections*, 04 Jun 2010

AFPD 10-9, *Lead Command Designation and Responsibilities for Weapon Systems*, 08 Mar 2007

AFPD 20-1, *Acquisition and Sustainment Life Cycle*, 03 Apr 2009

AFI 21-204, *Nuclear Weapons Maintenance Procedures*, 30 Nov 2009

AFI 31-401, *Information Security Program Management*, 01 Nov 2005

AFI 33-360, *Publication and Forms Management*, 18 May 2006

AFI 91-101, *Air Force Nuclear Weapons Surety Program*, 13 Oct 2010

AFI 91-111, *Safety Rules for U.S. Strategic Bomber Aircraft*, 14 Feb 2006

AFI 91-114, *Safety Rules for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Systems*, 03 Apr 2006

AFH 38-210, *Air Force Best Practices Clearinghouse*, 09 Apr 2001

Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*

AF Smart Operations for the 21st Century Playbook, 5 Oct 2007

Abbreviations and Acronyms

(Added-ANG) AATC—Air National Guard / Air Force Reserve Test Center

AD—Active Duty

(ANG) AD—Alert Detachments

AF—Air Force

AFDW—Air Force District of Washington

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Information Management System

ANG—Air National Guard
AQL—Acceptable Quality Level
ARC—Air Reserve Component
(Added-ANG) BDT—Bureau Directed Travel
CAF—Combat Air Forces
CCI—Controlled Cryptographic Item
CFETP—Career Field Education and Training Plan
C- MAJCOM—Component Major Command
(Added-ANG) CIRF—Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities
COMSEC—Communications Security
CoP—Community of Practice
COR—Contracting Officer’s Representative
COTR—Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative
(Added-ANG) CRTC—Combat Readiness Training Centers
CSAF—Chief of Staff of the Air Force
DRU—Direct Reporting Unit
DSV—Direct Safety Violation
EPE—Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation
FAR—Federal Acquisition Regulation
FOA—Field Operating Agency
(Added-ANG) FOL—Forward Operating Locations
(Added-ANG) GSU—Geographically Separated Units
HAF—Headquarters Air Force
IAW—In Accordance With
ICBM—Intercontinental Ballistic Missile
IG—Inspector General
(Added-ANG) IW—Intelligence Wings
JQS—Job Qualification Standard
LAN—Local Area Network
LCAP—Logistics Compliance Assessment Program
(Added-ANG) LGTTP—LG Total Travel Program
LII—Logistics Interest Item

(Added-ANG) LRS—Logistics Readiness Squadron
LSEP—Logistics Standardization Evaluation Program
MAF—Mobility Air Forces
MAJCOM—Major Command
MIS—Maintenance Information System
MNCL—Master Nuclear Certification Listing
MPA—Manpower Authorization
(Added-ANG) MSG—Mission Support Group
(Added-ANG) MXG—Maintenance Group
NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NCE—Nuclear Certified Equipment
(Added-ANG) NGB/A4Q—NGB Inspections Division
NSI—Nuclear Surety Inspection
NWRM—Nuclear War Reserve Materiel
OI—Operational Instruction
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PACSS—Production Acceptance Certification Standard System
PAD—Program Action Directives
PCW—Previously Complied With
PE—Personnel Evaluation
PIC—Positive Inventory Control
PMAP—Performance Management Assessment Program
(Added-ANG) POC—Point of Contact
P-PLAN—Performance Plan
PWS—Performance Work Statement
QA—Quality Assurance
QAE—Quality Assurance Evaluator
QASP—Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan
QVI—Quality Verification Inspection
(Added-ANG) RW—Reconnaissance Wings
SECAF—Secretary of the Air Force
SI—Special Inspection

SOW—Statement of Work

TDV—Technical Data Violation

TMPE—Trainer Maintenance Proficiency Evaluation

T.O.—Technical Order

UCI—Unit Compliance Inspection

UCNI—Unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information

UCR—Unsatisfactory Condition Report

WSSR—Weapons System Safety Rules

VPN—Virtual Private Network

Attachment 2

LEAD MAJCOM DESIGNATIONS

A2.1. 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).

A2.1.1. Air Combat Command is the Lead MAJCOM for Combat Air Forces (CAF); except for B-2 and B-52 aircraft, Air Launched Cruise Missiles, nuclear gravity munitions, UH-1N, and Common Vertical Lift Support Platform helicopters.

A2.1.2. Air Education Training Command is the Lead MAJCOM for training and the Air Force Academy.

A2.1.3. Air Force Materiel Command is the Lead MAJCOM for equipping.

A2.1.4. For the purpose of this instruction the Air National Guard Readiness Center will act as the Lead MAJCOM for Air National Guard.

A2.1.5. Air Force Reserve Command is the Lead MAJCOM for the Air Force Reserve.

A2.1.6. Air Force Special Operations Command is the Lead MAJCOM for special operations.

A2.1.7. Air Force Space Command is the Lead MAJCOM for cyber and space.

A2.1.8. Air Mobility Command is the Lead MAJCOM for Mobility Air Forces (MAF) and Air Force District of Washington (AFDW).

A2.1.9. For the purpose of this instruction, the DRU/FOAs will act as the Lead MAJCOM where appropriate for subordinate units.

A2.1.10. Pacific Air Forces is the Component MAJCOM for U.S. Pacific Command.

A2.1.11. U.S. Air Forces Europe is the Component MAJCOM for U.S. European Command and Lead MAJCOM for the NATO weapons mission.

A2.1.12. Air Force Global Strike Command is the Lead MAJCOM for B-2 and B-52 aircraft, Air Launched Cruise Missiles, nuclear gravity munitions, UH-1N, Common Vertical Lift Support Platform helicopters, and ICBMs.

A2.1.13. Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, a subordinate of AFMC, will be the Lead for CONUS Weapons Storage Area sustainment mission requirements.

A2.2. 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.

A2.2.1. For evaluations of mixed CAF/MAF units, the LCAP Team will use the standard LCAP checklist and the CAF supplement for the CAF units and the MAF supplement for the MAF units.

Attachment 3

LCAP UNIT REPORT FORMAT

A3.1. 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.

A3.1.1. Submit the final report in a write-protected format signed by the LCAP Team Chief and endorsed by the Lead MAJCOM A4 or Deputy A4 in coordination with the C-MAJCOM when applicable. For associate units the draft and final reports will be provided to all applicable MAJCOM A4s.

A3.2. The report will contain, at a minimum, the following sections:

A3.2.1. 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.

A3.2.2. LCAP Wing Rating Summary: Provides a color-coded summary of LCAP unit scores. Refer to paragraph A2.2.12 for a summary example.

A3.2.3. Evaluation Team: Provides a list of the entire LCAP Team that participated in the evaluation.

A3.2.4. 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.

A3.2.5. 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 pertinent to a unit's performance.

A3.2.6. LCAP Scorecard: Provides a detailed breakdown of overall scoring criteria including comprehensive results in each focus area, pass rates for PEs, QVIs, SIs, and quantities of observations and findings. Refer to Table A2.2. for an example.

A3.2.7. Assessment Summary: Provides a complete listing of the failed evaluations and inspections as defined in paragraph 3.5. and findings as defined in paragraph 3.7. to include all applicable references.

A3.2.7.1. The assessments 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 listing of assessments in lieu of this section as long as program intent is met.

A3.2.8. LII (non-graded): Provides a summary of LII assessments completed.

A3.2.9. **(Optional)** Other Significant Findings: Provides a narrative of findings that are outside the scope of the unit LCAP evaluation but significant enough to warrant MAJCOM and AF attention. This identifies issues beyond the unit's ability to control or affect. They will not be included in the unit's LCAP score.

A3.2.10. **(Optional)** Recommended Improvement Areas. Provides a summary of processes, products, or capabilities which could be improved by a suggested course of action.

A3.2.11. **(Optional)** Unit Strengths. Provides a summary of unit strengths and positive processes observed during the evaluation. The LCAP Team Chief may identify potential Best Practices following the procedures contained in AFH 38-210, *Air Force Best Practices Clearinghouse*.

A3.2.12. **(Optional)** Outstanding Performers: The LCAP Team Chief may elect to identify personnel or teams that demonstrate a superior level of professional excellence and personal responsibility.

A3.2.12. **(ANG)** The ANG LCAP team recognizes Honor roll members, Outstanding Performers, Outstanding Teams, and Outstanding Units. These individuals' names will be listed in the assessed 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.

A3.2.12.1. **(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.

A3.2.12.2. **(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.

A3.2.12.3. **(Added-ANG)** Outstanding Teams consist of individuals whose collective performance significantly contributes to the unit's mission. Assessors identify Outstanding Teams by direct observation or review of the teams' accomplishments and impact on the unit's mission.

A3.2.12.4. **(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.

A3.2.13. 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 A3.1. Sample Wing Rating Summary Table

UNIT	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	SATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	UNSAT
Wing X			82.4%		
Group A			85.5%		
Squadron A1		90%			
Squadron A2			81%		

Group B			84.3%		
Squadron B1		91.5%			
Squadron B2				79.1%	
ETC.					

Table A3.2. Sample Scorecard

ITEM OF INTEREST	EXAMPLE	YOUR INFORMATION
Dates Of The Assessment	1 - 4 Oct 09	
Organization	1st Fighter Wing	
MAJCOM	ACC	
Component	AD/ANG (TFI)	
Nuclear/Non-Nuclear	Non-Nuclear	
Total # of DSVs	5	0
Total # of TDVs	1	0
Total # of UCRs	3	0
Total DSV/TDV/UCR % Reduction	4.5%	0.0%
# of Major Findings	31	
# of Minor Findings	49	
# of Repeat Findings	5	0
Repeat Finding % Deduction	2.5%	0.0%
Overall Score By % (After Deductions)	73.0%	#DIV/0!
Overall Grade (After Deductions)	Marginal	
Overall Grade Awarded By The Team	Satisfactory	

Focus Area: Compliance w/Nuclear Surety Standards		
A. Failed Assessments	0	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	0.0%	#DIV/0!
C. # of DSVs	0	0
D. # of TDVs	0	0
E. # of UCRs	0	0

Focus Area: Qualified and Proficient Workforce		
A. Failed Assessments	17	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	16.2%	#DIV/0!
C. # of DSVs	0	0
D. # of TDVs	0	0

E. # of UCRs	0	0
--------------	---	---

Focus Area: Compliance with TOs, Instructions, Manuals, and Directives		
A. Failed Assessments	23	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	21.9%	#DIV/0!
C. # of DSVs	0	0
D. # of TDVs	1	0
E. # of UCRs	0	0
Sub-Focus Area: Human Factors		
A. Failed Assessments	11	0
B. # of DSVs	0	0
C. # of TDVs	0	0
D. # of UCRs	0	0
Sub-Focus Area: Inadequate Guidance		
A. Failed Assessments	7	0
B. # of DSVs	0	0
C. # of TDVs	0	0
D. # of UCRs	0	0
Sub-Focus Area: Documentation		
A. Failed Assessments	5	0
B. # of DSVs	0	0
C. # of TDVs	1	0
D. # of UCRs	0	0
Sub-Focus Area: Human Factors		
A. Failed Assessments	5	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	21.7%	#DIV/0!
Sub-Focus Area: Inadequate Guidance		
A. Failed Assessments	8	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	34.8%	#DIV/0!
Sub-Focus Area: Documentation		
A. Failed Assessments	10	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	43.5%	#DIV/0!

Focus Area: Compliance and Management Safety Programs		
A. Failed Assessments	29	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	27.6%	#DIV/0!
C. # of DSVs	3	0
D. # of TDVs	0	0
E. # of UCRs	1	0

Focus Area: Facilities and Equipment Condition		
A. Failed Assessments	31	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	29.5%	#DIV/0!
C. # of DSVs	2	0
D. # of TDVs	0	0
E. # of UCRs	2	0

Focus Area: Asset Accountability		
A. Failed Assessments	5	0
B. % of Failed Assessments	4.8%	#DIV/0!
C. # of DSVs	0	0
D. # of TDVs	0	0
E. # of UCRs	0	0

Total Assessments	525	0
# of Passed Assessments	420	0
# of Failed Assessments	105	0
Overall Pass Rate (Without Deductions)	80.0%	#DIV/0!

Total PE Assessments	315	0
# of Passed PE Assessments	280	0
# of Failed PE Assessments	35	0
Overall PE Pass Rate (Without Deductions)	88.9%	#DIV/0!

Total QVI Assessments	131	0
# of Passed QVI Assessments	102	0
# of Failed QVI Assessments	29	0
Overall QVI Pass Rate (Without Deductions)	77.9%	#DIV/0!

Total SI Assessments	79	0
# of Passed SI Assessments	56	0
# of Failed SI Assessments	23	0
Overall SI Pass Rate (Without Deductions)	70.9%	#DIV/0!

Previous Score Awarded	90.2%	0.0%
Previous Grade Awarded	Excellent	N/A

Logistics Interest Item (LII) (Not a graded event)		
HAF LII MX Hazardous Cargo Shipment (ex.) Assessments	14	0
# of Failed HAF LII Assessments	1	0
HAF LII Fall Protection (ex) Assessments	9	0
# of Failed HAF LII Assessments	0	0
MAJCOM LII SEI Compliance Assessments	10	0
# of Failed MAJCOM LII Assessments	0	0

Attachment 4

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

A4.1. General Evaluation Guidance. The procedures in this attachment apply to all evaluations including nuclear tasks. Evaluation requirements specific to nuclear LCAP evaluations are clearly identified.

A4.1.1. 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.

A4.1.2. 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.

A4.1.3. Evaluations will encompass the total scope of the task to include: tool usage, general maintenance/supply chain management practices, technical data usage, conduct of logistics processes, adherence to instructions/manuals/directives, and nuclear surety practices, etc.

A4.1.4. Evaluators may conduct an evaluation while using training items or in training facilities.

A4.1.5. Nuclear weapons maintenance, loading 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 CJCSI 3263.05 *Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspections* for additional guidance concerning this information.

A4.1.6. 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), AF Form 2435, *Load Training and Certification Document* or MIS (i.e. PACSS in AFMC). This verification must be completed before the final grade is validated.

A4.1.7. 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.

A4.1.8. 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.

A4.1.9. Evaluations may be accomplished during actual task performance or while inspecting equipment or documentation. However, evaluators may assign tasks to evaluate personnel proficiency. Evaluators will not participate in the task being performed.

A4.1.10. Evaluators must afford every reasonable opportunity for technicians/teams to detect a defect or deficiency.

A4.1.11. 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.

A4.2. 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:

A4.2.1. 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.

A4.2.2. All logistics actions performed are subject to evaluation.

A4.2.3. Safety and security should not be compromised for any reason.

A4.2.4. All detected errors during the evaluation will be used to calculate an overall award of “Pass” or “Fail”.

A4.2.5. 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.

A4.2.6. 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.

A4.2.7. The evaluator may ask questions or inject a task to determine technician/team knowledge of the task under evaluation. The technician/team may use technical references to answer any questions.

A4.2.8. The technician/team is responsible for completion of all tasks and related actions. The evaluator's presence does not shift this responsibility.

A4.2.9. The technician/team may ask for technical help from personnel/agencies normally available during day-to-day operations. The LCAP evaluator will use professional discretion to determine if the request and time delay are reasonable.

A4.2.10. For nuclear LCAP evaluations, the evaluator will not be considered the second person to satisfy the Two-Person Concept.

A4.3. 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.

A4.3.1. All detected errors during the evaluation will be used to calculate an overall grade using the criteria listed in Table A3.1.

A4.3.2. Detected errors during the evaluation will be classified as “Major” or “Minor” using the evaluation criteria listed in Table A3.2, applicable HAF/MAJCOM or local Quality Assurance program standards.

A4.3.3. Technicians/Teams that commit any error classified as a “Major” in Table A3.2 anytime during the evaluation process will be rated “Fail”.

A4.3.4. 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:

A4.3.4.1. Terminate the task immediately.

A4.3.4.2. Notify the technician's/team's work center supervisor or Flight CC/Superintendent.

A4.4. Evaluator Post-Task Performance Actions. The evaluator must perform the following actions as soon as practical after the evaluation:

A4.4.1. Award an overall rating of “Pass” or “Fail” for the evaluated task using guidance in Table A3.1.

A4.4.2. Critique the technician/team on the entire task. The critique must cover the following:

A4.4.2.1. A detailed explanation of each detected error including who received it, category, mission impact and correct procedures.

A4.4.2.2. A review of the technician's/team's strengths and weaknesses.

A4.4.2.3. Recommended methods of task accomplishment.

A4.4.2.4. An exchange of ideas and techniques.

A4.4.2.5. 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.

A4.4.3. 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:

A4.4.3.1. Correct the observation immediately, if possible.

A4.4.3.2. Document all facts surrounding the observation for report purposes.

A4.4.3.3. Notify LCAP Team leadership of the observation for verification purposes.

A4.4.3.4. Ensure the verified observation is included in the draft report.

A4.5. Additional Trainer Proficiency Evaluation (TPE) Guidelines. In addition to the general guidelines described in paragraphs A3.1 thru A3.4, when conducting TPEs, LCAP evaluators will:

A4.5.1. Coordinate with unit instructors/trainers on which tasks are acceptable for TPEs.

A4.5.2. Brief the following items to the instructor/trainer under evaluation:

A4.5.2.1. 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.

A4.5.2.2. 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.

A4.5.2.3. 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.

A4.5.2.4. 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.

A4.5.2.5. 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". 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.

A4.6. 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 LCAP evaluators will follow the evaluation procedures described in this attachment to conduct TMPEs.

Table A4.1. 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: AQL will be determined by using HAF/MAJCOM standards or local Quality Assurance			

Program standards
 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 A4.1. (ANG) 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.			
	1a	No Major errors	The accumulation of no more minor errors as listed below does not exceed the AQL.			
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Go/No Go Task AQL= 0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Small Task AQL= 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Large Task AQL= 5</td> </tr> </table>		Go/No Go Task AQL= 0	Small Task AQL= 3	Large Task AQL= 5	Pass
	Go/No Go Task AQL= 0	Small Task AQL= 3	Large Task AQL= 5			
	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				
<p>NOTE: AQL will be determined by using HAF/MAJCOM standards or local Quality Assurance Program standards</p> <p>When applying the Rating Criteria, consider the following:</p> <p>1. Number of tasks evaluated. (Not general tasks such as use of technical data, common hand</p>						

tools, etc.)

2. Complexity and frequency of tasks evaluated.
3. Reasonable impact of each error committed.
4. Complexity of the program being inspected.

Table A4.2. Evaluation Error Criteria Description

GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

MAJOR ERRORS:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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).
4. Failure to have available and comply with required technical data while performing an action.
5. Individual not trained/certified on task being performed.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. Failure to recognize an acceptable condition/test that caused rejection of serviceable components or equipment.
10. 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.
11. Failure to follow custody transfer procedures.
12. A condition that creates an unreliable missile, missile component, equipment item or an unsafe or insecure environment.
13. 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.

Nuclear Evaluation Criteria:

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. Code Handling Violation. An error that, as a reasonable expectation, would result in a code compromise (Actual or Possible).
3. 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).
4. A condition which creates an unreliable nuclear weapon, and unsafe environment, or an insecure environment as defined in CJCSI 3263.05 *Nuclear Weapons Technical Inspections*.
5. 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.

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/recertification.
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 5**LCAP SCORE CALCULATION EXAMPLE**

A5.1. 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 LCAP Team observed 2 DSVs, 1 TDV and identified 1 repeat “Major” finding.

A5.2. To obtain the overall grade:

A5.2.1. Calculate the unit’s baseline score. Baseline Score: 135 passed events divided by 150 total events = 90%.

A5.2.2. Calculate the deductions. Deductions: 4 penalties (2 DSVs + 1 TDV + 1 repeat) multiplied by .5% = 2%.

A5.2.3. The unit overall grade is calculated by subtracting the deductions from the baseline score. Unit Overall Score: 90% baseline - 2% deductions = 88%.

A5.2.4. Using the five-tier grading scale from paragraph 3.9.3, the unit is rated “Satisfactory.”

Attachment 6
AIR FORCE FORM 4395

Figure A6.1. AF Form 4395

LOGISTICS COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (LCAP) FINDING RESPONSE							
1. FINDING CONTROL NUMBER		2. ORGANIZATION			3. SUBJECT		
4. REPORT DATE (YYYYMMDD)	5. INSPECTION DATE (YYYYMMDD)	6. INSPECTION TYPE	7. CATEGORY	8. RESLI			
9. DISCREPANCY							
10. PRINTED NAME OF LCAP EVALUATOR (Last, First, Middle Initial) AND RANK				11. OFFICE SYMBOL OF LCAP EVALUATOR		12. DSN PHONE NUMBER	
13. ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS CONCLUSION (S) AND CORRECTIVE ACTION						14. COMPLETION DATE	
						a. ESTIMATED (YYYYMMDD)	
15. MAJCOM FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS						b. ACT. JAL (YYYYMMDD)	
						16. DIVISION	
For MAJCOM Use Only							
18. MAJCOM FUNCTIONAL						17. SUSPENSE (YYYYMMDD)	
						19. MAJCOM APPROVAL OFFICIAL	
a. PRINTED NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) AND RANK		b. RECOMMENDATION		c. SIGNATURE		d. DATE (YYYYMMDD)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> OPEN <input type="checkbox"/> CLOSED		<input type="text" value="Click to sign"/>			
a. PRINTED NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) AND RANK		b. RECOMMENDATION		c. SIGNATURE		d. DATE (YYYYMMDD)	
		<input type="checkbox"/> CONCLUR <input type="checkbox"/> NCNCONCUR		<input type="text" value="Click to sign"/>			

AF FORM 4395, 20100726

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (When Filled In)

LOGISTICS COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (LCAP) FINDING RESPONSE
CONTINUATION