BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 36-2401

1 DECEMBER 1997

Personnel

CORRECTING OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORTS

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the SAF/AAD WWW site at: http://afpubs.hq.af.mil. If you lack access, contact your Publishing Distribution Office (PDO).

OPR: HQ AFPC/DPPPAE
(CMSgt Ann Lacey)
Supersedes AFI 36-2401, 1 August 1997

Certified by: HQ AFPC/DPP
(Col Stephen S. Lerum)
Pages: 26
Distribution: F

This instruction applies to active duty Air Force and participating Reserve and Air National Guard members. It shows how to correct airman and officer evaluation reports after they are made a matter of record. It carries out Air Force Policy Directive 36-24, *Military Evaluations,* and applies to Officer and Enlisted Performance Reports, Promotion Recommendation Forms, and Retention Recommendation Forms. It is also an administrative remedy prescribed by Air Force Instruction 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*. This instruction requires the collection and maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 and authorized by Title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.), Section 8013. Systems of Record Notice F035 AF MP D, *OPR/EPR Appeal Case Files,* applies. The prescribed form contains a Privacy Act Statement. Process supplements that affect any military personnel function as shown in AFI 37-160, volume 1, table 3.2, *The Air Force Publications and Forms Management Programs--Developing and Processing Publications*. Coordinate supplements with Headquarters Air Force Personnel Center (HQ AFPC/DPPPAE).

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This revision allows the Commander, AFPC, to appoint the AFPC Executive Director to the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (paragraph 1.1.1); gives the Commander, Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC) the authority to appoint an appeal board to consider enlisted appeals (paragraph 1.1.2); clarifies procedures for appeals not submitted by the ratee (paragraph 2.2); allows enlisted personnel to request supplemental promotion consideration in conjunction with an appeal application (paragraph 3.5.2); changes procedures for annotating corrections to evaluation reports (Table 4, Note 2); re-numbers and corrects the notes (Table 2, Notes 4 -11); corrects office symbols and addresses throughout; renumbers the attachments; expands information for applicants in attachment 1 (formerly attachment 2); clarifies procedures and requirements for appealing Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF) (attachment 1, paragraph A1.6); removes the sample AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports, and replaces it with written instructions (attachment 2); and, requires the Certifying Official to initial the

checklist blocks in Item 16 of the AF Form 948 (attachment 2). A | indicates revisions from the previous edition.

1. Program Elements.

1.1. Who Establishes the Board**.** The Commander, Air Force Personnel Center (HQ AFPC/CC), establishes the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) to assess requests to correct evaluation reports and to correct substantiated errors or injustices.

1.1.1. HQ AFPC/CC appoints the AFPC Executive Director, commissioned officers in the grade of Lt Col and above, and senior NCOs in the rank of SMSgt and CMSgt (to consider enlisted appeals) to the Board. Each Board will consist of a three-person panel composed of two board members and a board president. A board member or president who was, or is, an evaluator for an applicant cannot consider that person's appeal.

1.1.2. The Commander, Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC/CC) appoints senior NCOs and officers to consider appeals submitted by Reserve and Air National Guard enlisted personnel.

1.1.3. The Board works under the assumption that evaluation reports are accurate and objective. The applicant asking for reevaluation must therefore provide strong evidence to overcome the report's presumed validity.

1.2. How the Board Will Operate:

1.2.1. Board Members. Review applications and make independent recommendations to the Board President.

1.2.2. The Board President:

1.2.2.1. Considers the members' recommendations and decides the appeal.

1.2.2.2. Acts for the full Board on applications which involve administrative and technical corrections, or require waiving the time limit for an appeal.

1.2.3. The Board:

1.2.3.1. Does not permit personal appearances. Neither applicants nor their representatives can appear before the Board.

1.2.3.2. Handles all appeals confidentially and does not normally disclose information to outside agencies.

1.2.3.3. Refers cases for action to appropriate agencies or individuals, such as Air Force Office of Special Investigations, unit commander, and so on, if documents or statements do not appear to be authentic. The Manual for Courts Martial specifies penalties for creating false or forged official statements and documents. Civilian Air Force employees may be punished under federal law.

1.2.3.4. Reviews cases based on information supplied in the application. The Board is not an investigative body and does not obtain additional documentation in support of an application. If the Board decides to consider information to which the applicant has not had access, it will notify the applicant and allow him or her time to comment on the information.

1.2.3.5. Directs corrections to reports. The Board can modify a report in ways that differ from the applicant's requested changes.

1.3. Prohibited Requests. The Board will not consider nor approve requests to:

1.3.1. Void a report when the error or injustice can be corrected administratively.

1.3.2. Void a report while keeping attachments to that report.

1.3.3. Void an evaluator's section while keeping comments or ratings of subsequent evaluators.

1.3.4. Void an evaluator's comments but keep the ratings (or vice versa).

1.3.5. Delete required information or add unauthorized information to a report.

1.3.6. Change (except for deletions) an evaluator's ratings or comments if the evaluator does not support the change. When an evaluator supports changing ratings, all subsequent evaluators (including the commander on Enlisted Performance Reports, and the Management Level Review Board President on Promotion Recommendation Forms) must also agree to the changes (see attachment 1).

1.3.7. Reaccomplish a report without the applicant furnishing the new report.

1.4. Who Administers the Appeal Process. The Evaluation Reports Appeals Section (HQ AFPC/DPPPAE) manages the appeals process and executes Board decisions. Following the Board's decision, DPPPAE destroys all working papers, memoranda, worksheets, recommendations, and notes between board members or between the Board and DPPPAE which pertain to the case. The Board does not create nor maintain formal records of proceedings.

2. Military Personnel Flight (MPF) Instructions.

2.1. The MPF:

2.1.1. Counsels applicants.

2.1.2. Reviews applications for quality.

2.1.3. Processes and monitors all applications for correction or removal of evaluation reports (see paragraph 3.2 for exception).

2.1.4. Forwards copies of the application (see table 1) to HQ AFPC/DPPPAE or HQ ARPC/DSMO within 7 working days after receiving it. Attaches to each copy:

2.1.4.1. The contested report.

2.1.4.2. Any other report involved in the correction request.

2.1.4.3. The applicant's Unfavorable Information File (UIF) Summary, if any.

2.1.5. Provide the military addresses of active duty personnel and assists applicants in contacting retirees through the Worldwide Locator. Note: The Privacy Act protects retirees' addresses. (See attachment 1, paragraph A1.3.7.)

2.1.6. The Chief, MPF determines who is qualified to provide counseling and who (the NCOIC or Superintendent, Career Enhancement, is the minimum level) can certify the AF Form 948, **Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports**.

2.1.7. The MPF Counselor:

2.1.7.1. Must be knowledgeable of the appeals process; thoroughly familiar with the contents of this instruction; and, in particular, must carefully review attachment 1.

2.1.7.2. Explains application procedures and documentation requirements.

2.1.7.3. Provides an in-depth analysis of the applicant's documents to ensure they are relevant to the issues and contribute to the case.

2.1.7.4. Helps applicants complete AF Form 948 (see attachment 2).

2.1.8. The Certifying Official:

2.1.8.1. Reviews the application and ensures it includes necessary supporting documents.

2.1.8.2. Returns incomplete or poorly supported applications to the applicant with an accompanying memorandum detailing the specific deficiencies in the case. In addition:

2.1.8.2.1. The memorandum must explain to the applicant that this is not a final decision on their case but the MPF's assessment of how to strengthen the case.

2.1.8.2.2. Have the applicant indorse the memorandum indicating whether he or she has provided additional documentation or desires the appeal to be submitted "as is."

2.1.8.3. After reviewing the case, completes the checklist in Section 16 on the reverse of the AF Form 948, (see attachment 2) ensuring that all required actions have been completed and any required documents attached.

2.1.8.4. Adds any pertinent information in the remarks section of the application but does not comment on the application's merit, nor recommend its approval or disapproval.

2.2. Corrections Not Initiated by the Ratee.

2.2.1. When someone other than the ratee finds an error in an evaluation report, he or she brings the error to the attention of MPF personnel who ascertain the facts and, if necessary, initiate corrective action. If the error is a minor administrative one, the MPF corrects the report under the provisions of table 2. If the error cannot be corrected under table 2, then the MPF or the person discovering the error must apply for correction according to table 1, rule 5 using AF Form 948, or the ratee may apply on his or her own behalf according to table 1, rule 1-4 (as applicable). If someone other than the ratee submits the AF Form 948, the MPF must notify the ratee of the error and counsel him or her regarding the proposed course of action.

2.2.2. If the ratee signs an application the MPF prepares, the Board assumes the ratee agrees with the correction unless he or she indicates otherwise. If the ratee disagrees, he or she must explain why the correction should not be approved and suggest an alternative.

2.2.3. If the ratee does not sign the application, the MPF will present or send a copy of the appeal to the member with a memorandum explaining the error. Ask the member to provide written comments within 10 days from the date received. To ensure the member has had an opportunity to review the appeal, have him or her acknowledge receipt on the notification memorandum or use certified mail to document the date of receipt. Reasonable requests for an extension of the time limit should be approved.

2.2.3.1. When the member provides written comments, attach the applicant's response and a

copy of the MPF memorandum to the application and forward it to the Board.

2.2.3.2. If the member fails to respond, annotate the remarks section of the application with, "Comments from the ratee were requested but not received." Attach a copy of the MPF memorandum and either the member's acknowledgement or the certified mail receipt and forward the application to the Board.

3. Applicant Instructions.

3.1. Applying for Correction. You can file an appeal to correct or remove an evaluation report from your record if you believe the report is incorrect or unjust.

3.1.1. You must:

3.1.1.1. Clearly and concisely state what you want.

3.1.1.2. Make sure that no rule in this instruction prohibits your request (review paragraph 1.3 for a list of the types of requests the Board cannot approve and will not consider).

3.1.1.3. Supply clear evidence to support your application (review attachment 1 to this instruction):

3.1.1.3.1. Supporting statements must have dates and signatures. They must contain information specifically related to the period of time and issues involved in your application. When information is not firsthand, make sure the author identifies the source (see attachment 1, paragraph A1.2).

3.1.1.3.2. Documents must be originals or certified copies. (***EXCEPTION:*** Copies of evaluation reports, UIF summaries, etc., attached by the MPF, need not be certified.) Use originals whenever possible. If you must use a copy, make sure it is legible.

3.1.1.4. Use AF Form 948, (see attachment 2) and attach the supporting documents to it.

3.2. Waiving MPF Review**.** If you believe that sending your appeal through the MPF will result in personal retribution or will jeopardize people providing you with support, you may ask the Evaluation Reports Appeal Section (HQ AFPC/DPPPAE) to waive MPF processing and review. Contact HQ AFPC/DPPPAE by memorandum or telephone for guidance. Do not bypass the MPF and forward your application directly to HQ AFPC/DPPPAE unless you have prior approval to do so. Make sure to include your return address and send the correct number of copies of the application, reports, and other documents.

3.3. Meeting Time Limits:

3.3.1. You must submit your appeal within 3 years following the date the report became a matter of record. (If you do not know the exact date, add 2 months to the date the final evaluator signed the report.) If the report is more than 3 years old, you must request a waiver of the time limit (see attachment 1, paragraph A1.4).

3.3.2. If you must resolve an appeal before a specific date or event, such as a pending promotion or special selection board, you must submit your application so that it arrives at HQ AFPC/DPPPAE at least 45 days in advance. ***NOTE:*** Special selection and supplemental promotion boards are generally closed out 30 to 45 days prior to the convening date, and, in these instances, the

appeal must be received in HQ AFPC/DPPPAE no later than 45 days before the cutoff date for that particular SSB or Supplemental Board. Ensure prompt handling by printing "EXPEDITE FOR THE (event)" in red ink across the top margin of the AF Form 948.

3.4. Using Classified, Privacy Act, and Restricted Release Information:

3.4.1. Do not include classified information in the body of an appeal. You may, if necessary, include classified information in attachments. The applicant ensures classified attachments are submitted in accordance with security directives establishing control and mailing rules.

3.4.2. If you submit documents on someone else (for example, EPRs on other individuals, AF Forms 2096, **Classification/On-The-Job Training Action**, PCS orders, travel vouchers, etc., on supervisors or coworkers), make sure you do not violate the Privacy Act. Any appeals that contain such documents must include written permission from the concerned individual to use the documents in your appeal case.

3.4.3. If you feel that information in a restricted release file is essential to your case, you may ask the releasing agency to forward the information directly to HQ AFPC/DPPPAE. When submitting your request to the releasing agency, you must waive, in writing, the right to review the information. Include a copy of this waiver with the appeal application. When the Board has decided the appeal, HQ AFPC/DPPPAE destroys the restricted file or returns it to the releasing agency.

3.5. Requesting Special Selection Board (SSB) or Supplemental Promotion Consideration:

3.5.1. Active duty officers can, in conjunction with their appeal, request SSB consideration for promotion, Regular Air Force appointment, In-Resident Professional Military Education, Selective Early Retirement, or Reduction-in-Force separation Boards. You should review AFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, chapter 6, for additional information on SSBs.

3.5.2. Active duty enlisted personnel may request supplemental promotion consideration in conjunction with the appeal application. You should indicate this on your appeal application; however, you must have your squadron commander's concurrence when submitting this request. If the commander concurs, he or she must complete the indorsement on the AF Form 948.

3.6. Resubmitting an Appeal:

3.6.1. You can resubmit an appeal only if you have substantial new evidence which the Board did not initially consider.

3.6.1.1. Do not resubmit an application when the only documentation added to the case is a statement which simply rebuts the Board's previous decision. The Board does not view a rebuttal statement as new evidence and will decline to reconsider the case. Statements from members of the rating chain which respond directly to questions or concerns posed in the previous decision memorandum are acceptable new evidence.

3.6.1.2. Include all previous documentation with the new application.

3.6.2. You can apply to the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) for correction if you are not satisfied with an ERAB decision.

4. Wartime Provisions. During a major war or limited engagement, HQ AFPC/CC can suspend this instruction. On returning to peacetime status, HQ AFPC/CC will direct the reinstatement, in whole or in part, of this instruction.

5. Form Prescribed. AF Form 948, **Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports**.

Table 1. How to Submit Requests For Correction.

RULE	A If you are	B and	C then submit the request	D to
1	the ratee and serving on active duty (AD) or extended active duty (EAD)	the desired action is allowed under this instruction (see paragraph 1.3)	on AF Form 948 in three complete copies including supporting documents (see notes 1 and 3)	the ratee's MPF which sends the application to HQ AFPC/DPPPAE, 550 C Street West Suite 8 (Bldg 499), Randolph AFB TX 78150-4710 (see notes 2 and 3).
2	the ratee and a participating USAF Reserve or Air National Guard airman or officer not serving on EAD		on AF Form 948 in four complete copies including supporting documents (see note 1)	the ratee's MPF which sends the application to ARPC/DSMO, 6760 East Irvington #4000, Denver CO 80280-4000, which processes it as required (see notes 2 and 3).
3	the ratee and are retired; are a non-participating reservist; or have been discharged, separated, dismissed, or dropped from rolls	you desire to appeal	on DD Form 149, **Application for Correction of Military Record Under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552**, according to AFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*, preferably in two complete copies including supporting documents	Review Board Office (SAF/MIBR), 550 C Street West Suite 40 (Bldg 499), Randolph AFB TX 78150-4742.
4	the ratee and the desired action is not allowed under this instruction (see paragraph 1.3)			
5	not the ratee and have found an error in an evaluation report	the desired action is allowed under this instruction (see paragraph 1.3)	in accordance with paragraph 2.2 and rules 1 or 2 (as applicable)	the office shown in rules 1 or 2 (as applicable).

NOTES:

1. Table 2 lists errors that are correctable without formal application.
2. See paragraph 3.2 for routing exception.
3. The MPF or ARPC/DSMO, as applicable, maintains a complete copy of the application and forwards the original and remaining copy or copies as required.

Table 2. Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluation Reports.

R U L E	SECTION I: Minor Errors **Do not make corrections using this table if any doubt exists about the appropriateness of the request**. Instead, submit a formal application according to table 1 with the questionable circumstances fully outlined. Any person who knows of an error that is correctable under this table should bring it to the attention of the MPF Evaluations Section. If the request is to correct an error in:
1	Ratee identification data (name, grade, Social Security Number (SSN), component, or organizational element) or the identification data of an evaluator who signed the report (name, grade, SSN, duty title, organizational element, date of signature, or final evaluator's position). (See note 1.) Go to Section II.
2	Ratee's duty Air Force specialty code, duty title, or level of duty. (See notes 2 and 6.) Go to Section II.
3	The "from" or "thru" date of the report, the number of days of supervision, or the reason for report. (See notes 3 and 4.) Go to Section II.
4	The marking of a concur or nonconcur box or to add a missing rating. (See note 5.) Go to Section II.
5	Spelling, punctuation, or a "heading" in an evaluator's comments. (See notes 7 and 8.) Go to Section II.
6	The ratee's name or grade in an evaluator's comments. (See note 7.) Go to Section II.
I T E M	SECTION II: Appropriate Offices Depending on the ratee's grade, submit the request by any convenient means (generally via memorandum or message) to the appropriate office listed below which may approve or deny the corrective action.
A	TSgts and below (AD or EAD): MPF Evaluations. (See notes 9 and 11.)
B	MSgt selectees through SMSgts (AD or EAD): MPF Evaluations to the Senior NCO Records Section (HQ AFPC/DPPBR2). (See notes 9, 10, and 11.)
C	CMSgts selectees and CMSgts (AD or EAD): MPF Evaluations to CMSgt Matters Division (HQ AFPC/DPAC). (See notes 9, 10, and 11.)
D	2nd Lts through Lt Cols (AD or EAD): MPF Evaluations and the MAJCOM or similar activity having custody of the command selection record to the Officer Performance Report Section (HQ AFPC/DPPBR1). (See notes 9, 10, and 11.)
E	Col selectees and Cols (AD or EAD): MPF Evaluations and the MAJCOM or similar activity having custody of the command selection record to the Colonels' Group (HQ USAF/DPO). (See notes 9, 10, and 11.)
F	All general officers and brigadier general selectees: To the Assistant for General Officer Matters (AFGOMO). (See notes 9 and 11.)
G	All non-EAD ANG or USAFR officers and airmen, colonels and below: Through MPF to ARPC/DSMO. (See notes 9, 10, and 11.)

NOTES:

1. Submit an application according to table 1 to change or add signatures, signature dates on referral reports and documents, and to substitute a reaccomplished report. Changes to the final evaluator's position (section VIII, AF Form 911, **Senior Enlisted Performance Report, MSgt thru CMSgt**) will be made only when the MPF/Evaluations determines conclusively that an error exists.

2. You can change the report when approved documentation existed on or before the close date of the report and the report has not been considered by a Central Selection Board. If approved documentation did not exist, was subsequently approved, or the contested report has been considered by a Central Selection Board, submit a request according to table 1.

3. If a correction to either the period of report or the number of days of supervision would invalidate the requirement for that or any other report on file, you must submit a request according to table 1.

4. If changing the close date of an enlisted report would result in the ratee receiving a supplemental promotion consideration, you must submit a request according to table 1.

5. CAUTION: Take extreme care when adding missing ratings or correcting concur and nonconcur boxes.

a. Submit an application according to table 1 when:

1. The rater's rating or ratings are missing.

2. An indorser's rating or ratings are missing and the nonconcur box is marked, or neither box is marked.

b. You can correct a missing rating when there is no question as to what rating the evaluator intended. If the slightest doubt exists, you must submit an application according to table 1.

c. You can correct an unmarked or mismarked concur or nonconcur box when, after reviewing the evaluator's comments and rating, no question exists as to which box should have been marked. If a rating is also missing or doubt exists, submit an application according to table 1.

6. Submit a formal application according to table 1 to request changes to the impact on mission accomplishment, unit mission description, or the job description.

7. Do not change references such as airman or sergeant to reflect the person's actual grade.

8. Do not change phrases, sentence structure, or grammar under this table.

9. If the request is invalid, incomplete, or questionable, return it through any previous processing levels to the correction initiator with appropriate instructions. The initiator must identify all required changes because changing a report's closing date can change the number of days of supervision, the reason for report, the signature dates, or the "from" date of the subsequent report.

10. Offices that agree with the requested action correct their copy of the report before forwarding the request to the next required level. The original report holder may reverse these corrections.

11. If the request is valid, correct and annotate the original report according to table 4, note 2. The person certifying the correction must be a SSgt, GS-4, or above. You need not provide copies of the corrected original report to other record holders.

Table 3. Correcting AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation.

RULE	A	B	C	D
	If you wish to correct an error in (see note 1)	and the error is verified by, and supporting documents come from	then request the correction by	and forward the request for correction to
1	Sections I, III (item 1), V, VI, VIII, or X; or spelling or punctuation in the comments (see notes 2 and 3)	the senior rater, MPF or the management level	message or datafax	HQ AFPC/DPPPAE, 550 C Street West, Suite 8, Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4710.
2	Sections II or III (item 2)	the senior rater	an application under table 1 (see note 4)	
3	Sections IV or IX	the senior rater and the president of the Management Level Review Board (MLR) (see note 5 and attachment 1, paragraph A1.6)		

NOTES:

1. When you have sent a Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF) to HQ AFPC, but it is not yet a matter of record (has not been filed in the Officer Selection Folder) contact the Evaluations Operations Branch (HQ AFPC/DPPPEB) for instructions.
2. You can change the duty title under this rule when the approved documentation existed on or before the date the PRF was prepared. If approved documentation did not exist, or was approved after the PRF preparation date, submit a formal application under rule 2.
3. Do not change phrases, sentence structure, or grammar under this rule.
4. If a promotion board has not considered the PRF, you can datafax the application to HQ AFPC/DPPPAE.
5. If a promotion board has not yet considered the PRF, the management level can confirm coordination with the MLR president and his or her recommendation by message or datafax.

Table 4. Correcting and Disposing of Documents.

RULE	A	B	C	D	E
	If the action is a correction	that	then the agency authorized to make the correction is	who	and
1	directed by the ERAB and ratee is in grade E-7 or higher	changes an evaluation report	HQ AFPC/DPPPAE or ARPC/DSMO	corrects or initiates correction of the report (see notes 2 and 3)	distributes copies of the corrected report, AF Form 77, **Supplemental Evaluation Sheet**, or other documents to records custodians with appropriate instructions (see note 7).
2		voids an evaluation report		prepares an AF Form 77 (see note 4)	
3		attaches a memorandum of mitigation or an AF Form 77 to a report		annotates the document (see note 5)	
4	directed by the ERAB and ratee is in grade E6 or below	changes an evaluation report	MPF Evaluations Element (See note 1)	corrects the report (see notes 2 and 3)	
5		voids an evaluation report		prepares an AF Form 77 (see note 4)	
6		attaches a memorandum of mitigation or an AF Form 77 to a report		annotates the document (see note 5)	
7	directed by the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)	is indicated in the Secretary of the Air Force Memorandum	HQ AFPC/DPPPAE or ARPC/DSMO.	corrects or initiates correction of the report as directed by the AFBCMR (see note 6)	

NOTES:

1. Do not correct or remove evaluation reports until either HQ AFPC/DPPPAE or ARPC/DSMO provides written instructions.
2. On the bottom, reverse margin, type “CC” (for corrected copy), followed by the date, authenticator's organization, office symbol, and signature. (Example: CC, 1 Jun 97, HQ AFPC/DPPPAE...) Align authenticator data in margin to allow adequate space for punched holes. The person signing the annotation must be a SSgt, GS-4, or above.
3. For reports being reaccomplished, you can annotate the signature blocks of evaluators not reasonably available ORIGINAL SIGNED. If used, the comments and ratings of the evaluators must be copied verbatim from the original report.
4. For voided reports (excluding imbedded training reports and PRFs), prepare an AF Form 77 with the statement: "Not rated for the above period. Report was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." If voiding reports for two or more consecutive reporting periods, you can prepare one AF Form 77, but you must show the close date of each report. For imbedded training reports, prepare an AF Form 77 with the statement: "A training report for the above period was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." For a PRF, enter the statement: "AF Form 709, **Promotion Recommendation**, for promotion board (specify the promotion board, for example, 0589A) was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." Use a similar statement for voided retention forms.
5. Annotate documents with ACCEPTED FOR FILE--ATTACH TO (closing date) REPORT followed by the authenticator's data listed in note 2.
6. Unless otherwise directed by the AFBCMR, annotate reports according to note 2. For voided reports, prepare an AF Form 77 according to note 4 except show the report was removed "By Order of The Secretary of The Air Force."
7. Return original documents to the applicant. Supporting documents in an AFBCMR application are retained by that board. You can write to the AFBCMR for copies of these documents.

MICHAEL D. McGINTY, Lt General, USAF
DCS/Personnel

Attachment 1

APPEAL GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS
(LOCAL REPRODUCTION AUTHORIZED)

A1.1. Overview. If you intend to file an appeal, you should read this attachment. Military Personnel Flight (MPF) appeals counselors must be familiar with the contents of this attachment. In this attachment, "evaluation report" encompasses all versions of enlisted and officer performance reports, promotion recommendation forms, and forms used by selective early retirement and reduction-in-force separation boards. Complying with the following guidelines will not guarantee you a favorable decision; however, not complying can cause the board to delay its decision, return your application without action, or not have sufficient information to reach a fair and equitable decision. Contact the MPF for advice.

A1.2. Documenting Your Appeal. You must provide convincing documentation for your appeal. The willingness of evaluators to change a report is not enough. You must offer *clear* evidence that the original evaluation was *unjust* or *wrong*. Quality, not quantity of documentation is the issue. If the reason you are including a particular item of evidence is not obvious, explain why you have attached it to the application or what it proves. Do not bother to submit general documents (letters of appreciation, character reference statements, nonspecific inspection reports, etc.). If your application has many attachments, use tabs to separate them. (Both the original and copy of the package sent to the ERAB should be tabbed.) Before submitting your appeal, review the documents you have attached and make sure they are:

A1.2.1. Credible - does the support come from a person who is credible; was in a position to have firsthand knowledge of the situation and provide a reasoned evaluation? (Or are they former or subsequent supervisors, peers, friends, onetime customers, etc.?) If you are submitting a document, does it prove what it is supposed to? For example, shift schedules, OJT records, and feedback notices do not prove when supervision began.

A1.2.2. Relevant - to the time and issue. Evaluation reports assess performance over a very specific period of time and your support must relate to that period. Does your documentation stick to the issues (i.e., the basis for your appeal)? For example, if you are appealing based on a “personality conflict,” general character references, job recommendations, or letters of appreciation would do little to support the alleged “conflict” and usually are not relevant.

A1.2.3. Believable - from a common sense standpoint. Look at your evidence dispassionately and ask, “Can I buy this?”

A1.3. Statements . The most effective evidence consists of statements from the evaluators who signed the report or from other individuals in the rating chain when the report was signed. Such statements should:

A1.3.1. Cite important facts or circumstances that were unknown when the evaluators signed the report.

A1.3.2. Detail the error or injustice.

A1.3.3. Explain how and when it was discovered.

A1.3.4. Include the correct information.

A1.3.5. Relate to the contested reporting period.

A1.3.6. Address the allegations and substantially challenge or disprove comments or ratings in the report.

A1.3.7. Contacting Retirees. To contact a retired person, place your memorandum in a stamped envelope.

A1.3.7.1. Address the envelope partially by writing your name and return address, and the retired person's name.

A1.3.7.2. Enclose the partially addressed envelope in a separate envelope to the Worldwide Locator (HQ AFPC/MSIMDL, 550 C St. West, Suite 50, Randolph AFB TX 78150-4752).

A1.3.7.3. Include the retired person's grade, full name, and social security number, if known.

A1.3.7.4. Include a note explaining about the appeal and asking the Locator to forward your memorandum.

A1.4. Time Limit Waivers. You can request a waiver of the 3-year time limit by citing unusual circumstances that prevented you from filing a timely appeal. Grounds for a waiver do *not* include:

A1.4.1. Failing to understand the appeals process.

A1.4.2. Being discouraged from appealing by superiors, peers, or counselors.

A1.4.3. Failing to understand how serious an impact a report could have on your career in later years.

A1.4.4. Not reviewing your records during the intervening years.

A1.5. Common Appeal Reasons and Related Documentation Requirements. Some common reasons for appealing and types of documentation are outlined below. Complying with these guidelines will not ensure approval of a request.

A1.5.1. Impact on Promotion or Career Opportunity. A report is not erroneous or unfair because the applicant believes it contributed to a nonselection for promotion or may impact future promotion or career opportunities. The Board recognizes that nonselection for promotion is, for many, a traumatic event, and the desire to overturn that nonselection is powerful motivation to appeal. However, the Board is careful to keep the promotion and evaluation issues separated, and to focus on the evaluation report only. A simple willingness by evaluators to upgrade, rewrite, or void a report is not a valid basis for doing so. You must prove the report is erroneous or unjust based on its content.

A1.5.2. Ratings and Comments Inconsistent with Prior or Subsequent Evaluations. Ratings are not erroneous or unjust because they are inconsistent with other ratings you have received. A report evaluates performance during a specific period and reflects your performance, conduct, and potential at that time, in that position. An ability to function well in one position at a given time may change in another job at another time. Sometimes an individual can stay in the same job and a change in supervisors will produce a change in performance standards which, depending on how well the individual adapts, could cause a marked change in the next report. The Board will not approve requests to void reports simply because they are inconsistent with other evaluation reports.

A1.5.3. Comments Inconsistent with Assigned Ratings. Retrospective views of facts and circumstances, months or even years after the report was written, will usually not overcome the Board's presumption that the initial assessment remains valid. You are unlikely to convince the Board simply by comparing an evaluator's comments and ratings.

A1.5.4. Deflationary Rating Programs. Evaluators must accurately assess personnel and control inflation. Therefore, to appeal on this basis, you must clearly establish that the evaluator did not use the Air Force evaluation policy in effect at the time and, as a result, you were not rated fairly in comparison to your peers evaluated at the same time.

A1.5.5. Personality Conflict. In worker-supervisor relationships, some disagreements are likely to occur since a worker must abide by a supervisor's policies and decisions. Personnel who do not perform at expected standards or require close supervision may believe that an evaluator is personally biased; however, the conflict generated by this personal attention is usually professional rather than personal. To convince the Board that an evaluator was unfavorably biased, you must cite specific examples of the conflict or bias. Provide firsthand evidence that clearly shows how the conflict prevented the evaluator from preparing a fair and accurate report. If other evaluators support an appeal because they were unaware of a conflict at the time, they should provide specific information (and cite their sources) which leads them to believe the report is not an objective assessment.

A1.5.6. Coercion by Superiors. The Board seriously and carefully evaluates any allegation of coercion by superiors. The Air Force requires endorsers, reviewers, and commanders to review evaluation reports for quality and to control inflationary tendencies. These officials must reject poorly prepared reports and downgrade or reject inflated reports. Evaluators who change their evaluations after talking with a superior have not necessarily been coerced. Clear evidence must exist proving that the superior violated the evaluator's rating rights. Supporting statements must identify the person who did the coercing, list the specific threats that were made, and identify any witnesses who can corroborate the incident.

A1.5.7. Undue Emphasis on Isolated Incidents. Although you may feel that evaluators have over stressed an isolated incident or a short period of substandard performance or conduct, the evaluators are obliged to consider such incidents, their significance, and the frequency with which they occurred in assessing performance and potential. Only the evaluators know how much an incident influenced the report; therefore, the opinions of individuals outside the rating chain are not relevant. Retrospective statements from evaluators prepared several months (or even years) after the incident or following a period of improved performance do not carry as much weight as assessments made when the facts and circumstances were fresh in their minds. To convince the Board, evaluators must provide specific information about the incident and why they now believe it was overly emphasized.

A1.5.8. Lack of Counseling or Feedback. Only members in the rating chain can confirm if counseling was provided. While current Air Force policy requires performance feedback for personnel, a direct correlation between information provided during feedback sessions and the assessments on evaluation reports does not necessarily exist. For example, if after a positive feedback session, an evaluator discovers serious problems, he or she must record the problems in the evaluation report even when it disagrees with the previous feedback. There may be occasions when feedback was not provided during a reporting period. Lack of counseling or feedback, by itself, is not sufficient to challenge the accuracy or justness of a report. Evaluators must confirm they did not provide counseling or feedback, and that this directly resulted in an unfair evaluation. You must also supply specific information about the unfair evaluation so the Board can make a reasoned judgment on the appeal. Finally, every airman knows the existing standards for indebtedness, weight, fitness, etc. Lack of counseling in these areas provides no valid basis for voiding a report.

A1.5.9. Alleged Discrimination or Unfair Treatment. Air Force members must report any form of discrimination to their supervisors or commander. If you file a complaint late in a reporting period or

after a report closes, it may appear that you complained to create doubts about the report's fairness and accuracy. If you believe that you have been the victim of discrimination, your best evidence is an official equal opportunity and treatment (EOT) investigation, reviewed and validated by appropriate officials. As an alternative, you may use statements from officials in the rating chain or other credible sources who have firsthand knowledge of the discrimination. You must prove that an evaluator was biased and that the bias affected the person's objectivity to the point a fair, accurate report was impossible.

A1.5.10. Evaluation Completed on Wrong Form. The Board does not void a report because it was completed on the wrong form. The report will either be reaccomplished or superimposed on the correct form.

A1.5.11. Administrative Issues. The Board does not normally void reports because of administrative errors. To convince the Board, you must prove that the report would have been substantially different without the error. Normal procedure is to correct the administrative error rather than void the report.

A1.5.12. Evaluation Inconsistent with Awards or Decorations Covering the Same Reporting Period. Citations are not specific enough to offset the comments and ratings in a report. Awards and decorations are usually submitted by members of the rating chain who are fully aware of the contested report. Therefore, an approved award or decoration alone does not challenge the accuracy of a report.

A1.5.13. Personal Opinions and Unsupported Allegations. Do not make statements you cannot support with evidence. Your personal opinions will not convince the Board to approve your application. Unsubstantiated conjecture about the motives of your evaluators, or how or why your report turned out as it did, do not contribute to your case. You must provide factual, specific, and substantiated information that is from credible officials and is based on firsthand observation or knowledge.

A1.5.14. Mismarked Ratings. The instructions governing the Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems clearly require evaluators (and no one else) to mark reports, and prohibit them from signing blank or unmarked forms. You will need statements from all evaluators who signed the report. These statements must fully explain how the error occurred and why the evaluators did not notice the error when they signed the report. Sometimes the typist or administrative section is blamed for such errors, in which case a statement from them can help. If the unit has a policy which requires raters to sign blank forms, or prohibits them from marking their ratings, a statement from the unit commander (or other person that imposed and enforced the policy) will be needed. The Board usually directs the report be corrected or reaccomplished rather than voided.

A1.5.15. Evaluation Report Not Indorsed by Mandatory Indorser. A report not indorsed at the required level is normally corrected instead of voided. Identify the proper mandatory indorser and obtain the omitted indorsement. You can have the report reaccomplished or have the indorsement placed in the correct section of a blank form and signed. Include statements from the evaluators explaining the error.

A1.5.16. Lack of Observation. Applications based on the fact that you and your evaluators were geographically separated, working on a different shift, or your evaluators were new to the job, require conclusive documentation showing they had no valid basis on which to assess performance. Many individuals have to perform duties without the benefit of direct daily supervision; therefore, separation alone is not a good argument. Finally, indorsing officials have to be in the rating chain only on or after the report's close-out.

A1.5.17. Report Not Written by Designated Rater. The Air Force does not require the designated rater to be your immediate supervisor. Inaccurate designations and failures to change raters can occur when personnel are reassigned, work centers reorganized, functional areas or units realigned, etc. To prove your case, you will need statements from both the individuals who signed the report and from the individuals who believe they should have written the report. They should cite the from and thru dates of their supervision and explain what happened. The "erroneous" evaluator must clearly explain why he or she wrote and signed the report when they were not the rater. Likewise the "correct" evaluator must explain why he or she did not write the report even though they were supposed to. Also helpful is a statement from the unit commander, if possible, providing specific information.

A1.5.18. Insufficient Supervision. To appeal based on insufficient supervision, you need:

A1.5.18.1. Computer-generated products or other documents that substantiate when supervision began and ended.

A1.5.18.2. A statement from the rater listing the from and thru dates of supervision and the from and thru dates of absences of 30 or more consecutive days during the rating period.

A1.5.18.3. Copies of paid travel vouchers or a statement from the Accounting and Finance Office listing from and thru dates of travel during the reporting period. For absences due to hospitalization, leave, or on-quarters status, include a leave and earning statement from the Accounting and Finance Office or a statement from the Hospital Registrar showing the from and thru dates of absences.

A1.5.18.4. Understand that OJT records, feedback notices, and performance feedback worksheets do not document the date supervision began. They document only that an OJT entry was made, a feedback notice produced, or a feedback session took place.

A1.5.18.5. Proof of absences of 30 or more consecutive days during a rating period. You cannot deduct: TDY time if you and your evaluator served together; periods of loan to another section or organization when there is no change of rater and TDY orders are not published; or, when TDY is part of normal duties (for example flight crew members often perform TDY to do their job). If a valid absence was not deducted from the period of supervision and you worked for the evaluator after the report's closing date, the Board normally directs adjusting the report's close-out date.

A1.5.18.6. Often, evaluators feel that 60 or 120 days is not a sufficient time to evaluate a ratee. However, Air Force standards establish that normally 120 (and in certain situations, as little as 60) days are adequate to be able to provide a valid assessment. This standard applies Air Force-wide and appeals based on the rater's belief that the 120 days are not enough time are not approved.

A1.5.19. Memorandum of Mitigation. You can get a memorandum of mitigation to attach to a report from an evaluator who signed the original report or from someone in the rating chain at the time of the original evaluation. The memorandum must present information that was not known at the time of the report's preparation and must explain the comments or ratings. You cannot use a memorandum of mitigation simply to add information to a report when there was not enough space on the original report to include it. The memorandum must be no more than a single, typed page. It must not discuss promotion status or potential or any other subject or material if this information was not allowed in the original report. Do not emphasize comments by using bold type, underlines, unusual fonts, etc.

A1.5.20. Lack of Training**.** You will require supporting statements from rating chain officials who can give specific information about the training problem and its impact on the evaluation report.

Since failing to provide training and failing to document training are different problems, OJT records, reviews of OJT records, and OJT inspection reports do not prove training was not conducted, only that training was not documented.

A1.5.21. Forged Signature. Allegations of a forged signature on a report must be confirmed by a notarized statement from the actual evaluator or by the results of an investigation.

A1.5.22. Reaccomplishing an Evaluation Report. If you are requesting a report be reaccomplished, you must furnish a substitute report in your appeal case (see paragraph 1.3.7). The substitute report must:

A1.5.22.1. Be signed by the evaluators who signed the original report (this includes the commander on EPRs). Only for extremely compelling reasons may the original evaluators be removed from the substitute. Simple PCS or retirement are usually not sufficient reasons.

A1.5.22.2. Be on the correct form not only for your grade, but also for the time the original report was written. For example, if you are reaccomplishing a Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF) for a CY 93 Board, the Aug 88 version of the AF Form 709 must be used, not the Jun 95 edition of the form. Similarly, if you are reaccomplishing an EPR which has a close-out date of Jan 95, the substitute must be on the Jan 93 edition of the AF Form 910/911, not the Jun 95 version.

A1.6. Special Information on Appealing AF Form 709, Promotion Recommenda tion (PRF). (See table 3.)

A1.6.1. General Information. A material error in the PRF itself; substantive changes to the record of performance used to assess your performance-based potential; or, a material error in the PRF preparation process, may justify changes to your PRF. Normally, comments and recommendations are required from the senior rater who signed the PRF and the Management Level Review (MLR) president who reviewed it. If the senior rater is deceased or retired and not available, the MLR president who originally reviewed the PRF can act instead. When the senior rater is available but the original MLR president is deceased or retired and not available, the current MLR president can act in his or her place. (Note: An evaluator is considered *not available* when they are incapacitated or, after reasonable efforts, cannot be located or contacted. You should include in your application documentation that shows when and how you attempted to contact an evaluator, such as certified mail receipts, and so forth. An evaluator will not be *substituted* or *bypassed* simply because they will not support an application, or because you do not believe you will have time to locate or contact them prior to a specific date or event.)

A1.6.1.1. Substantive additions, deletions, changes, or corrections to an officer's record of performance include voiding a referral or negative report; adding a previously missing OPR or Training Report; removing a negative indorsement or adding a positive one; replacing a report with a substantially different one, and so on. The change must, in effect, remove negative information from an officer's record or add positive information which was not previously known. A simple administrative change to an evaluation report rarely meets this criteria.

A1.6.1.2. Senior raters and MLR presidents who provide comments and recommendations must carefully consider what, if any, impact the correction or change may have had on the final PRF content, rating, or the preparation process. They will need to explain the change to the record of performance, its impact on the PRF, and how the requested PRF action relates to the changed record of performance. Appeals based on errors in the preparation process must also be fully

explained and substantiated. Senior raters must weigh the impact of the processing error on the PRF and explain how the error justifies the requested PRF change.

A1.6.1.3. The management level that initially processed the PRF can best route PRF appeals to the appropriate MLR president. Since management levels may have different procedures for processing PRF appeals, contact the appropriate one for instructions. If the management level no longer exists, contact HQ AFPC/DPPPAE for instructions.

A1.6.2. PRF Appeal Requirements: It is impossible to list exact instructions for each type of appeal; so, if necessary, contact HQ AFPC/DPPPAE for guidance on appeals not covered in this instruction. The following list describes minimum required documentation for the Board to reach a fair and equitable decision on your appeal:

A1.6.2.1. Voiding a PRF. You must provide substantial evidence proving the PRF does not contain a valid promotion potential assessment, and that it is not possible to correct the form.

A1.6.2.2. Changing Section IV (Promotion Recommendation) requires the concurrence of both the senior rater and MLR president. Section IV of the PRF should "provide key performance factors from the officer's entire career." Obviously, the space on the form is limited and it is not usually possible to describe every achievement in an officer's career. The senior rater bears the responsibility of selecting what to include in the PRF, and what to leave out; which portions of the officer's career to concentrate on, and which portions to have supported by the record. While he or she may request inputs from subordinate commanders, to do so is not mandatory. To change Section IV, the senior rater will need to demonstrate there was a material error in the PRF; a material error in the record of performance which substantially impacted the content of the PRF; or, a material error in the process by which the PRF was crafted. In all instances, the requested change to Section IV must be related to the documented error. Appeals to rewrite Section IV simply to include different, but previously known or documented accomplishments will not be approved.

A1.6.2.3. Changing the overall recommendation (Section IX) to a "promote" rating requires the concurrence of both the senior rater and MLR president. The senior rater provides detailed information about the circumstances surrounding the requested change and the rationale for the correction. The MLR president reviews the request and recommends for or against the change. The senior rater and MLR president should not support a requested change to the PRF unless a material error exists.

A1.6.2.4. Changing the overall recommendation (Section IX) to a "definitely promote" (DP) rating must be fully justified and requires the concurrence of both the senior rater and MLR president. In the promotion process, DP ratings are strictly controlled, and awarded after a competitive review of the senior rater's pool of eligibles identifies the top officers. The MLR validates the senior rater's decision and conducts a similar competitive review in awarding carry-over or aggregate DPs. In determining whether to seek award of a DP via an appeal, senior raters and MLR presidents must, as much as possible, replicate the original competitive process. Senior raters and MLRs needing assistance in identifying their original pool of eligibles should contact HQ AFPC/DPPPE, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709 to obtain a Master Eligibility List (MEL) and copies of records of performance which may be needed for the board in question. The senior rater details the circumstances surrounding the requested change, the rationale for the correction, and the method (an earned DP allocation, aggregation or carry-over) by which the DP rating would have been awarded originally. As with other PRF appeals, there must be a material

error in the PRF, record of performance, or process, and it must be shown how that error resulted in an erroneous rating. In addition:

A1.6.2.4.1. When the senior rater identifies an "earned DP allocation," he or she certifies that the applicant's corrected record would have been awarded a DP rating in competition with the senior rater's original pool of eligibles. After reviewing the circumstances of the appeal and the applicant's record, the MLR president recommends whether the DP rating should be confirmed.

A1.6.2.4.2. If the senior rater believes a DP rating would have been awarded under aggregation or carry-over, the MLR president reviews the request, the circumstances surrounding the error, and its impact on the strength of the applicant's record. The MLR president, after a competitive review, determines if the corrected record would have been sufficiently strong to have earned a DP at the original MLR, and makes the appropriate recommendation.

A1.6.3. Changing PRFs Reviewed by a USAF Student Evaluation Board or a USAF Evaluation Board for Officers in Competitive Categories Other Than Line of the Air Force. The same requirements listed above apply except after meeting the senior rater's requirement, forward the appeal to HQ AFPC/DPPPE for processing. HQ AFPC/DPPPE serves as the Management Level for these boards and will secure a recommendation from the MLR president.

A1.6.4. Board Review. The Board is extremely careful in considering appeals of PRFs. The decision whether or not to grant or deny the appeal rests with the Board, which has the independent responsibility to make the determination. Senior rater, MLR president, and other inputs and/or recommendations are factors which the Board will consider in making its determination. It is not bound by any of the recommendations. The Board determines the weight it will give to all such inputs.

A1.7. Special Information on Appealing AF Form 3538, Retention Recommen dation (RRF).

A1.7.1. The Board carefully evaluates RRF appeals and obtaining the support outlined below does not guarantee approval, but is the minimum required for the Board to reach a fair and equitable decision.

A1.7.2. Voiding an RRF. Evidence requirements are similar to evidence requirements for voiding other report types. You must provide substantiating evidence that the form contains an unjust or inaccurate assessment of your potential for continued service.

A1.7.3. To change the narrative comments, or the retention recommendation, you must have the support of the evaluators who signed the form. The first evaluator is generally the primary person to substantiate the form is inaccurate. He or she details the circumstances surrounding the error and explains why it should be corrected. The second evaluator reviews the circumstances and provides a recommendation. On occasion, the same person may be responsible for the first and second evaluators' portions of the form. If major changes are needed, fill out a new form and attach it to the request for correction.

Attachment 2

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING

AF FORM 948, APPLICATION FOR CORRECTION/REMOVAL OF EVALUATION REPORTS

Item Number and Title	Instructions
1 through 6 - IDENTIFICATION DATA	Enter data pertaining to the ratee of the contested report.
7 - RESIDENCE MAILING ADDRESS	Required for those who may be PCSing or separating/retiring before the Board decision is rendered. Also required for applicants who have been authorized to bypass the MPF review. Optional for all others.
8 - TYPE OF REPORTS BEING APPEALED AND THE THRU DATE	List all reports being appealed by the type of report (i.e. EPR, OPR, Training Report, LOE, PRF, etc.). Identify EPR/OPR/Training Reports/LOEs by their THRU (close-out) date; PRFs by the BOARD ID (section VII on the form).
9 - SSB/SUPPLEMENTAL PROMOTION CONSIDERATION FOR EAD OFFICERS AND ACTIVE DUTY ENLISTED PERSONNEL	Applies only to officers who are currently on Extended Active Duty and active duty enlisted personnel. For Reserve or Air National Guard officer and enlisted personnel, check the "N/A" block. Special Selection Board consideration applies to Central Promotion Boards; Regular AF Boards; In-Resident Central PME Boards; SERB and RIF Boards. Clearly identify the Board for which you desire reconsideration. For example, "promotion to Major, CY94A", "RegAF augmentation, CY 95", or "SMSgt, 96E8".

10 - ACTION REQUESTED

Clearly identify the action desired for each report being appealed. For example, "Void Report;" "Change DAFSC to reflect....."; "Add Senior Rater Deputy Indorsement." If a new report is to be substituted, ask for substitution, not to void the original report (e.g., "Substitute attached report containing Senior Rater indorsement for report currently on file"). Make sure the action you are requesting is not prohibited by paragraph 1.3. For enlisted members, indicate if you are also requesting supplemental promotion consideration. You **must** attach commander's concurrence with the request.

11 - REASONS TO SUPPORT REQUESTED ACTION

Completely describe the error or injustice. For ease of consideration, list each allegation that applies to your application sequentially. Then, as needed, fully address each allegation. If you need more space, continue on plain bond paper. If your statement is extremely lengthy, you may enter "See Statement at Attachment ___" and attach your full statement.

12 - WAIVER OF TIME LIMIT

See paragraphs 3.3 and A1.4. If the report was a matter of record for over 3 years, you must request a waiver of the time limit for appealing. Use this section to explain why you were not able to submit the appeal in a timely manner.

13 - NUMERICAL LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

List all attachments in numerical order and identify each. For example:

1. Contested EPR C/O 14 May 95
2. Statement MSgt Smith 13 Sep 95
3. TDY Travel Voucher 12 Mar 95
4. Substitute 14 May 95 EPR

If you need more room, continue on plain bond paper. If you have numerous attachments, use tabs to make the case easier to review.

14 - SIGNATURE/DATE	If the applicant does not sign the application, the MPF must ensure he or she complies with the provisions of paragraph 2.2.3. Applicants will sign and date the form the day they turn in their completed appeal to MPF Evaluations. MPF must forward the application within 7 duty days after receiving it.
15 - COMMANDER'S CERTIFICATION FOR ENLISTED SUPPLEMENTAL PROMOTION CONSIDERATION	If the applicant is requesting supplemental promotion consideration in conjunction with the appeal, the unit commander must indicate a recommendation for approval or disapproval. Include the commander's typed name, grade, signature, and the date signed.
16 - MPF CERTIFYING OFFICIAL'S CHECKLIST	The MPF Certifying Official must review the appeal case; ensure all required documents are present; and, initial in the appropriate "YES" or "NO" block in Item 16. The Certifying Official also uses this section to add any pertinent information the MPF may have; to explain any delay in the processing of the case; and, to list any documents attached by the MPF (i.e. UIF Summaries). Applicants who have been authorized a waiver to MPF processing are responsible for completing the checklist and ensuring all requirements are met. They must also use this section to enter the authority for the waiver (e.g., "MPF review waived per telecon with MSgt Jones , HQ AFPC/DPPPAE, 4 Apr 96").
17 - CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	Name, grade, and duty title. Designated by the MPF Chief, but must, as a minimum, be the NCOIC or Superintendent of Career Enhancement.
18 - MPF MAILING ADDRESS	Complete mailing address of the Evaluations Element which submitted the appeal.
19 - SIGNATURE OF CERTIFYING OFFICIAL	Self explanatory.
20 - DATE	If more than 7 duty days after the date the applicant signed the form (Item 14), include an explanation of the delay in Item 16.

21 - TELEPHONE NUMBERS Include DSN and area code (for overseas MPFs).